DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 860 FL 011 441

AUTHOR Gonzalez, Andrew: Alberca, Wilfredo
TITLE Philippine English of the Mass Media.
INSTITUTION De La Salle Univ., Manila (Philippines).
SPONS AGENCY Philippine Social Science Council, Manila.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 144p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Contrastive Linguistics: Descriptive Linguistics: *English: *Language Variation: Lexicology: Mass Media: Phonology: *Pronunciation: *Regional Dialects: *Standard Spoken Usage: *Written Language
IDENTIFIERS *Philippines: Tense (Verbs)

ABSTRACT

A frequency count was conducted of linguistic features in the English of the Philippine mass media. Philippine English was found to have a smaller inventory of phonological units than Received Standard English. Vowel reduction does not seem to be prevalent. The collapsing of phonological distinctions is most evident in vowels and fricatives. Syllable structures consisting of complicated consonant clusters are simplified. Shifting of stress is distinctive, especially in words of more than three syllables. There seems to be a preference for sustained juncture at the end of clauses and phrases. Spelling pronunciations are prevalent. In written Philippine English, there exists a local set of rules for tenses, and tense sequence tends to be lacking. Local use of prepositions is found, as well as unusual lexical and collocational items that cannot be explained by linguistic borrowing. The diachronic evolution of a future Standard Philippine English is predicted and tentatively described. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189860

PHILIPPINE ENGLISH OF THE MASS MEDIA

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC
and
Wilfredo Alberca

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Andrew Gonzalez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Research Council
De La Salle University
Manila, Philippines
Preliminary Edition
1978

FL 011 941

F O R E W O R D

Funding for this research project was provided by the De La Salle University Research Council, the De La Salle University Science Foundation, and by the Philippine Social Science Council (discretionary research award).

The data summarized in Chapters 2 and 3 were earlier submitted by the junior author as part of his doctoral dissertation entitled 'Distinctive Features of Philippine English in the Mass Media' at the University of Santo Tomas Graduate School; the dissertation was written with the senior author as mentor.

We are deeply grateful to the funding agencies for making this research possible.

Manila
June 30, 1978

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC
Wilfredo Alberca

O U T L I N E

Section

1. Introduction

2. Distinctive Features of Spoken Philippine English of the Mass Media

3. Distinctive Features of Written Philippine English of the Mass Media

4. Careful (Reading) and Casual Styles of Spoken Philippine English and Formal and Informal Styles of Written Philippine English of the Mass Media

5. Summary and Conclusions

References

Appendices

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the Study

The English language in the Philippines came with the American sailors of Admiral John Dewey in 1898, was propagated initially by more than 70,000 soldiers who came to the islands between 1898 and 1901 (Gleeck 1977:13) to pacify the insurrectos and later by public school teachers to be known as Thomasites who arrived aboard the USS Thomas on August 21, 1901, some 540 strong, and constituted the corps of teachers for the public schools set up by the civilian government.

While the Filipinos learned English fast and rapidly, (1903, when the first census was taken, there were practically no speakers of English in a total population of 6,987,686; fifteen years later, in 1918, 885,854 were listed as being able to read English out of a literate population of persons ten years or older totalling 3,138,634 [28% of the literate population]; in 1939, on the eve of the period of independence, 4,264,549 out of 16,000,303 [26.6% of the population] were listed as English speakers), the native speakers of English (their models) immediately noticed that even their best and most obliging pupils, including the ones they had sent to the mother country as pensionados, as early as 1903 spoke their newly-learned language with an accent.

The student of contrastive linguistics can readily explain such an 'accent' in the speech of the English-speaking Filipinos as largely a function of their local vernaculars, a group of Malayo-Polynesian languages closely related to the Western Indonesian languages. Moreover, because English was learned as a foreign language under the

tutelage of even the most meticulous and exacting school marms who insisted on correct grammar, certain errors kept creeping into the compositions of their newly acquired wards, so that even as early as 1925 , when the first pointed short story 'Night Stars' was penned by Estrella Alfon, there was something unmistakably foreign in the use of English, albeit grammatically correct, a foreign feature or quality not only arising from the untypically American referents (Philippine realities) of the short story but from the vocabulary choices and use of certain structural features to be pointed out by linguists of a later generation.

Essentially, then, a version of substratum theory can be used to explain the speech and usage of Filipinos who soon mastered enough of the system of the foreign language to be understood by their mentors. Thus was brought about, too, along with other countries which underwent the same experience of colonization, a situation of languages in contact which gave birth to varieties of English now known as Third World Englishes.

English was thus spoken by Filipino teachers and students alike, in a variety of dialects mutually comprehensible but distinctively non-American, except for the Filipino with an extraordinary ear and powers of mimicry, perhaps reinforced by a stay in the mainland, who picked up an American accent, or except for the aurally adept student of the Ateneo who exposed to British and American models picked up the so-called 'Arrneo accent' in his imitations of Shakespeare, an accent combining features of American English which the

American Jesuits naturally spoke and features of British English which the same American Jesuits brought to these shores. The result was neither American nor British nor Filipino--it was 'Arrneo', perhaps best examplified by the speech of Raul Manglapus.

With the post-War period and the Independence Period, and the gradual disappearance of native speakers of English in the educational system of the country to act as models and critic teachers and supervisors, it was inevitable that the oral mastery of English would change in character, not necessarily deteriorate, as the impression is often given; it evolved into a new variety of English as it is spoken and used in the Philippines.

Llamzon (1969) did some pioneering work on what he calls Standard Filipino English by demonstrating the existence of such a variety, which was comprehensible not only to Filipinos but likewise to native speakers of English especially in the United States. Moreover, he pointed to the educated elite of the Philippines as the exponents of such Standard Filipino English in its oral phase. Finally, he made the claim that in certain parts of Manila, this variety of English had become a first language for a small group of affluent Filipinos who used English at home.

Gonzalez (1972) reviewed Llamzon's work in detail, expressing his reservations about the use of the term standard as well as the existence of a group of first-language speakers. At best, one could claim that there were households which were bilingual and in which children were exposed from birth to either a vernacular (more than likely,

Tagalog) and English in the affluent households of Manila.

It was the use of the adjective standard which became the bone of contention, for in the observation of a majority, there were as many varieties of English in the Philippines (spoken as a second language) as there were groups of native speakers of various Philippine languages.

Even among the elites, especially the politicians in power, except for those who had had a stint of living in the United States for some period or who were educated in certain so-called elitist institutions in Greater Manila, the substratal first language of a speaker was almost always recognizable, be it Bisayan, Pampangan, Ilocano, or Tagalog. One could make the case that there were as many varieties of English as there were vernaculars or first languages or mother tongues in the Philippines, so that one could speak of a Bisayan or Pampangan or Ilokan or Tagalic variety of English (English spoken with a distinct, recognizable, predictable Bisayan, Pampangan, Ilokan or Tagalic accent) rather than a standardized Philippine variety.

Undoubtedly, with the ease of travel, migration, access to mass media, the transfer of peoples from one locale to another, including teachers, and urbanization, sooner or later, there is bound to be a standard form of English spoken in the English which one can rightly call Philippine (not Bisayan, not Ilocano, not Pampangan, not Tagalic) English (compared with American, British, Australian, Canadian, New Zealand, Indian English). We purposely use the term Philippine English instead of Filipino English to set up an adjectival parallel with these varieties of English

already mentioned.[1]

Judging from the developments of varieties of a language, the written form of the language is often sooner standardized than its spoken form. Moreover, in a country such as the Philippines, the agency which has the best chances of providing a variety for eventual standardization would be the mass media (for the spoken phase, radio and television; for the written phase, daily newspapers and popular magazines and periodicals).

Because of the realization that the most likely candidate for standardization in the Philippines and for that distinctively Philippine variety of Third World English that was bound to emerge would be from the mass media, the investigators undertook this research project with its present methodology.

We wanted to set down features of Spoken and Written English in the Philippine mass media in 1977-1978 that would provide the characteristics for the standardized variety that was bound to emerge as well as to provide the baseline linguistic data for comparison, so that a generation from now, should records be desired of what variety of English was emerging in the Philippines during the last quarter of the twentieth century after more than three quarters of a century of contact between English and the Philippine languages, some systematically gathered data might be available.

---

[1] A simple operational test of Philippine English as opposed to Ilocano, Pampangan, Tagalic or Bisayan English would be speech in which no distinct feature of Ilocano, Pmapangan, Tagalog, or Bisayan is detectable, that is, a Filipino, on hearing such speech, will be unable to detect whether the speaker is a native Ilocano, Pampangan, Tagalog, or Bisayan. This simple operational test has suggested by Sibayan and his associates at the Philippine Normal College.

1.2. Limitations and Methodology

It was necessary for the researchers to limit themselves to English as it is used in the mass media in the Philippines. Moreover, it was necessary to take a systematic sampling of both Spoken and Written English, and to set down operational criteria on frequency (how often used by how many people) to qualify for inclusion as a feature of the variety of English being examined. Finally, it was necessary to hypothesize certain structural categories under which to place the various features (phonological, lexical, syntactic) which informal observation had already indicated would probably qualify as possible distinctive features.

For Spoken English, data were obtained by taping seven newscasts involving twelve different radio announcers (seven major and five minor announcers) and by taping five newscasts from television involving ten different announcers (five major and five minor). The purpose was to gather data for a careful (reading) style of Spoken English. On the other hand, a casual (conversational) style of Spoken English was expected from the informal talk-shows on television, data from which were gathered by taping seven talk-shows involving a total of thirty-three (33) interlocutors, including the host or hostess.

For Written English, a total of fourteen publications (eight newspapers and six magazines) were studied; six of the newspapers were dailies while two others were weeklies. The magazines were all weeklies. Again, for the formal style,

news stories and news features were used, while for the informal style, columns and features which met our criteria for informality (see Chapter 3) were used as samples.

To qualify for inclusion as a feature, we arbitrarily set down the requirement that in Spoken English, at least three separate speakers would use the same feature at least three times in the course of a program (to make sure that the feature was a regular feature, and not a chance error, and that it was dialectal rather than idiolectal).

For Written English, we stipulated that the feature had to be used at least once in the same article or story or feature or column (the editing of a publication removing the probability of a random error, unless it was purely typographical) and used by at least six different writers (assuming a different writer for each news story, feature, article, or column), again to ensure that the feature was dialectal rather than idiolectal.

The categories arrived at were revised as the data were gathered, the categories finally used being convenient ones under which to group the features.

1.4. Related Studies

Mention has already been made of Llamzon's (1969) pioneering study.

Various studies on the features of the English language as spoken and used in the Philippines antedate Llamzon's study, however.

In the early decades of the American Occupation, there were accounts in the letters, diaries, and books written by Thomasites and government expatriates in the Philippines about the problems of teaching English in the Philippines, the multilingual situation in the Philippines which gave rise to different kinds of 'accents' or ways of speaking English according to one's mother tongue. And in the educational surveys (the Monroe Survey of 1925 as well as the Swanson Survey of 1960), inevitably, comments were made about the necessity of improving the teaching of English in the islands, with the implied observations about the accents used here as well as the errors noticed not only in speech but in writing. That these errors would become widespread enough to become acceptable even by educated Filipinos was something never conceived of by the expatriate teachers, however.

Yabes' (1975) collection of pre-War short stories in English written by Filipino authors represents one of the most interesting examples of a corpus of Philippine English literary writing as well as a very good indicator of how well the Filipino had learned his English and mastered it to the point where he could use it to talk about Philippine realities in a non-Philippine tongue.

There is an interesting study done by Raqueño (1952) as a doctoral dissertaion at the University of Santo Tomas comparing the composition errors of Filipino high school students in 1936 and in 1950; 1936 is significant insofar as it represents the beginning of the Commonwealth Period

and in effect the end of the American Occupation. The kinds of composition errors then which have persisted to the present today in some way presaged the grammatical features of Philippine English which through usage have become acceptable and are candidates for being accepted as standard forms.

But the first glimmerings in print of a plea to accept a Philippine variety of English called by the early writers, like Llamzon, Filipino English can be seen in Jamias (1951) who described the language of 'our literature in English' as a

> living language...on the lips and minds of an ever growing number of users, with a modified vocabulary and diction, idiom, and sentence structure, and a new cadence... [It] has all the promise of a new way of thought and talk. Upon this new, or rather newest, English, Filipino writers will 'erect' the literary language.

A pioneering experimental study of acceptable varieties of English as spoken in the Philippines was done by Aquino et al. (1966), who studied 'the most intelligible variety of English pronunciation for use in the Philippines' and categorized the varieties as American English, Filipino English which maintains phonemic distinctions, and Filipino English which suppresses some of the phonemic distinctions; the researchers found the second variety to be more intelligible than the third . Moreover, with the different items used in the testing instruments (listening and speaking), the investigators concluded that the kind of English most consistently spoken and interpreted by members of the six linguistic groups

tested (Ilocano, Tagalog, Bicol, Waray, Hiligaynon, Cebuano, Visayan) seems to have been broadly similar, regardless of which group was considered, thus indicating some empirical proof for the psychological reality of a variety of local English.

Along the same experimental lines, Tucker (1968) using the matched guise technique asked his subjects to judge personality from language usage using American English, Filipino English, and Tagalog; clearly, distinctions were made by the listeners on the differences between American and Filipino speakers and corresponding judgments made.

In Llamzon's 1969 study, he reports various experiments which demonstrate quite convincingly that Filipinos recognize certain accents as well as certain usages and structures as distinctively Filipino.

The above studies focus on Spoken Philippine English and confirm the existence of such a variety (its homogeneity or standardization is of course still to be proven).

Llamzon likewise compiled a list of what he called Filipinisms, terms and collocations found only in the Philippines (blue seal, open the light, to sound off somebody about something, etc.), which were more systematically studied by Dar (1973) and typologized as loanwords (mostly from Spanish, but used in an English running text), terms evolved by Filipino speakers (bakya crowd, bomba, to indian), terms found in American English but with different meanings (abortion for American English miscarriage, boy for male domestic help, hostess for bar girl), terms reflective of Philippine material culture as well as Tagalog influence; Philippine nicknames; local abbreviations.

Dar's study is interesting insofar as he used both written and spoken sources; it is complemented by Nordian Eusoof-Ponio's (1974) study which is based exclusively on written sources from newspapers. Ponio's study showed that most Filipinos found local usages acceptable, sometimes not being aware that they were local usages, while non-Filipinos found them unacceptable (from an error point of view, these usages were literal translations from Pilipino, wrong idioms, wrong choice of lexical items, examples of wordiness or incorrect use of prepositions), again arguing for the psychological reality of Philippine English using written sources as evidence.

Norma Martinez (1975), basing herself on Llamzon (1969), went so far as to write a manual called Standard Filipino English Pronunciation, which met with varying responses depending on one's persuasion regarding the acceptability of 'standard' Filipino English pronunciation features.

It is interesting to note that Meyer (1968) spoke of the English in the Philippines not as a native, foreign, or second language but as a 'transplant language', which is quite apt.

Interest in varieties of English, British (see Brook 1958) and American (Mencken 1919, Krapp 1955, Marckwardt 1958), has a long tradition, but detailed empirical studies on other varieties of English are relatively recent (see Bailey and Robinson 1973). Studies on Philippine English fall within the genre of 'Third World Englishes' and should be separated from studies of other types of English spoken in countries where English is a native language, not a second language; thus we have Australian English (Baker 1966),

New Zealand English (Turner 1966), Canadian English (Hamilton 1962). With other 'Third World Englishes' should be Puerto Rican English as it is spoken in New York City (Wolfram 1974) (we are not quite sure where to classify Black English [Wolfram 1969], Hawaiian English (Glissmeyer 1973), Indian, Pakistani, and Ceylonese English (see Kachru 1977), Liberian English (Candler 1977), Singaporean and Malaysian English (Tongue 1974, Tay 1978, Wong 1977, and Bailey and Robinson 1973), and African English (Povey 1977).

The present study attempts to improve on the Llamzon study by a tighter research design, by focusing on a definite corpus of Spoken and Written Philippine English, by limiting its inquiry to the English used in the mass media in the Philippines, by making an initial attempt to do systematic sampling and frequency counts, and by making no claims that the variety described has already been standardized but rather that if the English in the Philippines is to be standardized, the features described would clearly indicate the trend towards which this standardization will go. It thus attempts to make a contribution not only to content (the features themselves) but to methodology in investigation and to draw out in its later discussion some of the theoretical problems connected with inquiries of this type (for example, When does an error become acceptable enough to consider a feature of the standard language?). Finally, in its attempts to characterize more than one style (casual versus careful [reading] style in Spoken English and formal versus informal style in Written English) in a second language that has been transplanted as a result of colonial history,

it hopes to expand the domain of discussion of Third World Englishes to such varieties arising from stylistic differences.

1.5. Plan of the Study

The second section of the study will describe the distinctive features of Spoken Philippine English of the Mass Media, while the third section will describe the distinctive features of Written Philippine English of the Mass Media. An attempt is made in the fourth section to outline stylistic differences between careful (reading) and casual style in Spoken English and between formal and informal style in Written English of the mass media in the Philippines. The final section summarizes our findings and makes certain observations on methodology in studies of this type.

2. Distinctive Features of Spoken Philippine English of the Mass Media

2.1. Purpose

2.2. Sampling and Corpus

2.3. Operational Criteria for Inclusion as 'Distinctive'

2.4. Categories

2.4.1. Phonological Features

2.4.1.1. Distribution of Sounds in Certain Lexical Items

2.4.1.2. Vowels

2.4.1.3. Consonants

2.4.1.4. Consonant-Vowel Combinations

2.4.1.5. Word Stress

2.4.1.6. Rhythm and Sentence Stress

2.4.1.7. Intonation

2.4.2. Lexical Features

2.4.3. Syntactic Features

2.5. Summary

2. Distinctive Features of Spoken Philippine English

2.1. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to make an inventory of the distinctive features of Spoken Philippine English in the mass media based on operational criteria to be set down.

Using General American English (hereinafter GAE) (codified in Kenyon and Knott 1953) as the basis for comparison, the features to be set down as those of Philippine English (hereinafter PE) would be considered 'errors' in traditional contrastive analysis. The working assumption we have used as a guide is that so called 'errors', for the most part the result of the influence of the first language or mother tongue ('interference' in American Structuralist applied linguistics), can be accepted as the standard in Philippine society if enough influentials make use of these features. We have likewise assumed another principle, namely, that in the standardization process that Philippine English is undergoing at present, the influentials in the best position to provide the standard would be the speakers of the mass media (radio and TV) who have been selected by broadcasting corporations because they qualify as models; the constant exposure of these newscasters and announcers through radio and TV would put them in the best position to influence speech behavior.

The newscasters on both TV and radio were chosen as models for careful (reading) style. For casual style, we have chosen guests on talk-shows on television, presumably representing once more the influentials and the elites from

the educated sectors of society, for such guests would not be invited had they not achieved anything outstanding in their professions. The speech samples to be gathered from such talk-shows are unrehearsed and spontaneous (at least after the initial reserve is overcome) and would therefore present a qualitatively different style from the careful (reading), well-prepared and perhaps well-rehearsed, style of the newscaster reading from a written text.

The transcription used is the modified Philippine Center for Language Study transcription of the International Phonetic Alphabet, found in many teaching manuals in the Philippines at present (see Hemphill 1962).

2.2. Sampling and Corpus

For data on Spoken Philippine English, tapes were made of newscasts in English on radio and TV for one week, making sure that each radio or TV newscaster in the main stations would be taped at least once. Tapes were also made at least once of each of the TV talk-shows in English.

Seven radio newscasts involving twelve different announcers (seven major and five minor), five television newscasts involving ten different announcers (five major and five minor), and seven television talk-shows involving a total of thirty three (33) interlocutors (including the hosts) were used as samples and constituted the corpus for analysis. The terms 'major announcer/newscaster' and 'minor announcer/newscaster' are used arbitrarily, the former term being taken to mean an announcer/newscaster whose reading part comes ahead of any other, and the latter

term being understood to mean an announcer/newscaster whose reading parts come later than the first. In broadcasting jargon, the major announcer/newscaster would be the 'anchor-man'.

The phonetic symbols used are the following: Vowels [iy] as in seek, [i] as in sit, [ey] as in sail, [e] as in sell, [æ] as in sat, [ə] as in sun, [ə] as in sergeant, [uw] as in soothe, [u] as in shook, [ow] as in sole, [o] as in the Tagalog words 'aso' dog, 'bola' ball, and 'sopas' soup, [ɔ] as in sought. Consonants [p] as in pool, [b] as in ball, [t] as in tall, [d] as in dole, [k] as in call, [g] as in gall, [č] as in chill, [ǰ] as in jail, [f] as in fool, [v] as in veil, [θ] as in thrill, [ð] as in then, [s] as in sell, [z] as in zeal, [š] as in shell, [ž] as in treasure, [h] as in hell, [l] as in lull, [m] as in mall, [n] as in nil, [ŋ] as in long, [w] as in wail, [r] as rail, [y] as in yell. Diphthongs [aɪ] as in high, [au] as in sound, [ɔɪ] as in toy.

The seven radio and TV newscasts which were taped, the stations and channels, dates, times, total number of minutes are listed on Table 1. Likewise, the talk-shows which were taped, their program names, channels, dates, times, total number of minutes are listed on this table.

TABLE 1 Radio/TV Newscasts/'Talk Shows' Taped, Number of Minutes They Were Aired/Shown, and Number of Newscasters/Interlocutors in Each Newscast/'Talk Show' Studied

Radio/TV Newscast/ 'Talk Show'	Number of Minutes Aired/Shown	Number of Newscasters/ Interlocutors Studied
DWIC, 9:00-9:15 p.m.	15	1
DWRV, 9:00-9:15 p.m.	15	1
DZAC, 7:00-7:15 a.m.	15	1
DPI Radio, 12:00-12:15 p.m.	15	3
DPI Radio, 9:00-9:15 p.m.	15	4
DZRJ, 9:00-9:15 p.m.	15	1
DZXX, 7:00-7:15 a.m.	15	1
Newswatch, 7:00-7:30 p.m.	30	2
Newswatch, 8:30-9:00 a.m.	30	3
News at Seven, 7:00-7:30 p.m.	30	3
GTV News, 7:00-7:30 p.m.	30	1
GTV News, 7:00-7:30 a.m.	30	1
Interaction	60	5
Late Hour with June and Johnny	60	7
Dialogue	60	5
Cooking Up with Nora	20	2
Chronolog	30	3
Business with Pleasure	60	5
TV Debate on Life	60	6
Total	605	55

Other talk-shows such as Ms. Ellaneous, Metro Magazine and Seeing Stars were left out either because they allowed frequent code switching between English and Pilipino by the interlocutors or because they did not give the interlocutors adequate time to communicate in English. Four interlocutors, a Taiwanese, a German-American and two Spaniards, were likewise excluded, since they showed speech characteristics different from Philippine English. (Code-switching in the mass media has been intensively studied by Bautista [1974] and was not the subject of this study; where it sporadically occurred in the data, it was ignored.)

Initially, the researchers segregated the two styles, but the data yielded by the study made the segregation unnecessary in terms of structural (phonological, lexical and grammatical) features, since these features appeared in both styles. Section 4 will discuss non-structural differences in style. For purposes of this chapter, which focuses strictly on structural features (mainly phonological, some lexical, some syntactic), tabulation was made of the two corpora (tapes of careful and casual styles) together.[1]

---

[1]In general, newscasters seem to be selected by the station/channel managers on account of the close approximation of their speech to GAE and on account of extralinguistic variables as physical appearance, quality of voice, personality. Using GAE as the basis of comparison, the carefully read and well-rehearsed newscasts were definitely more 'correct' than the speech found in the spontaneous and unrehearsed talk-shows, even the anchor-man? By and large, the anchor-men in the talk-shows were fluent, articulate, spontaneous, but for the most part spoke with an accent. Clearly, in terms of trend indicators, the talk-show samples a better source than the careful speech of the newscasters. However, when looking at our data as a whole, we found that certain structural features which occurred regularly were found in both styles.

2.3. Operational Criteria for Inclusion as 'Distinctive'

To make sure that the feature was part of the system and not just a matter of performance, a chance occurrence due to situational limitations, the researchers established the criterion that only speech forms uttered at least three times by the same speaker would be listed as distinctive.

Moreover, to ensure that the feature was not idiolectal, that is, particular to a specific speaker, the second criterion for inclusion as distinctive was that the feature would occur among at least three speakers or interlocutors. In this way, we made sure that the feature cut across idiolects, that is, that it was dialectal.

Features which did not meet our criteria are listed as 'minor features' indicative of trends in linguistic change and will be discussed separately.

To illustrate the manner of counting, we would like to give the following example:

Speaker A says
- [o] for [ə] (major, support) eleven times
- [ə] for [ə] (pumping) once
- [ɪ] for [ɪy] (treatment) once
- [s] for [z] (difficulties, was) sixteen times

The over-all impression is given, however, that the newscasters speak a better approximation of GAE than the talk-show speakers. The manner of reading newscasts likewise follows a standard broadcast intonation which is appropriate only to the reading style and not to other styles.

Speaker B says
- [o] for [ə] (commitment, dominion) five times
- [a] for [ə] (running, number) four times
- [ɪ] for [ɪy] (scene) once
- [s] for [z] (reason, business) thirteen times

Speaker C says
- [o] for [ə] (October, reason) nine times
- [a] for [ə] (discuss, funding) three times
- [ɪ] for [ɪy] (freedom, speech) two times
- [s] for [z] (advantages, realize) four times

Speaker D says
- [o] for [ə] (referendum, solicitor) five times
- [a] for [ə] (under, love) five times
- [ɪ] for [ɪy] (teach) once
- [s] for [z] (has, programs) ten times

the [ə]-[o], [ə]-[a], and [z]-[s] substitutions will be considered distinctive features, the criterion established being that only features used at least thrice by at least three speakers should be considered distinctive. The [ɪy]-[ɪ] substitution, although used by more than three speakers, will not be considered distinctive, its frequency of occurrence being less than three times in the speech of each of the four speakers. It will be referred to only as a minor feature in the discussion of Philippine English features.

The speakers in the talk-shows had to be Filipino in nationality, educated, and their speech mostly in English, with occasional code-switching allowed, to be included among the interlocutors of the sample.

2.4. Categories

Phonological categories for features of Spoken Philippine English are distribution of sounds in certain lexical items, vowels, consonants, consonant-vowel combinations, word stress, rhythm and intonation.[2] Under lexical categories are terms and collocations, and under syntactic categories are various constructions.

2.4.1. Phonological Features

2.4.1.1. Distribution of Sounds in Certain Lexical Items

Although a Filipino speaker may be able to produce all the vowels and consonants of English, his production of its sounds may not be consistent in all lexical items. Thus, he may utter the mid-central unrounded vowel [ə] in the word about [ə'baut] correctly, but he may substitute for it another sound in another word, say, nation. Instead of pronouncing the word as ['neyšən], he may utter it as ['neyšon], an utterance which is never heard from a native speaker of SAE. Also, he may say the initial consonant of the second syllable in the word Rizal as a voiced alveolar fricative [z], but he may change [z] to a voiceless [s] in the word business. Thus, while he may pronounce Rizal as [ri'zal], he may say business as ['bisnes] rather than as ['biznes].

---

[2]The inventory of features uses segmental and suprasegmental units based on the phonetic model of American Structuralism, which unfortunately does not focus on such a fundamental notion as 'articulatory base'. Perhaps more than the features to be discussed, what phonetically distinguishes PE from GAE is that the former has a different articulatory base (for a discussion of articulatory base, see Kelz 1977) from the latter. However, at this stage, we are not in a position to discuss these differences.

This phenomenon--the inconsistent distribution of phonemes in certain lexical items--has been observed among speakers/learners of a second language (in this study, English), and it will be discussed in the following sections on vowels, consonants, and consonant-vowel combinations.

It is not then a question of being unable to pronounce the segmentals of English but to know their distribution in its lexicon. It will be observed that this difference in distribution is largely a function of spelling, since the Filipino learns English in school largely through the graphic medium. He pronounces words in speech as he has learned them through reading and writing. As a result, it will be observed that the substitutions are largely explainable by spelling pronunciations. Moreover, likewise because of these spelling pronunciations, the vowel reduction rule which reduces most unstressed vowels to the mid-central unrounded schwa in English is blocked in English because of learned spellings (see Chomsky and Halle 1968 for a discussion of the Vowel Reduction Rule).

2.4.1.2. Vowels

TABLE 2 Vowels Substituted for, their Substitutes, Frequency of Substitution, and Total Number of Newscasters and Interlocutors Using the Substitution at Least Three Times

Vowels	Substitute(s)	Frequency of Substitution	Total Number of Newscasters Using the Substitution at Least Three Times	Total Number of Interlocutors Using the Substitution at Least Three Times
e	o	268 x	13	27
	I	207 x	12	13
	ə	64 x	4	5
	eI[3]	60 x	4	4
æ	ə	157 x	9	16
ow	ɔ[4]	69 x	5	5
	o	42 x	3	6

[3] Not to be confused with English [ey] representing the tense mid-front unrounded vowel, as in date. The i letter does not represent a glide but the lax high-front vowel. Thus, the sound symbolized by [eI] is initially produced as [e] and suddenly shifts to [I].

[4] This sound may actually be between [o] and [ɔ] in tongue height, but for lack of a better phonetic symbol to represent the actual sound, the researchers decided to use the symbol for the lower mid-back rounded vowel.

Vowels	Substitution(s)	Frequency of Substitution	Total Number of Newscasters Using the Substitution at Least Three Times	Total Number of Interlocutors Using the Substitution at Least Three Times
Iy	I	50 x	2	6
ə	a	27 x	4	1
əy	ə	19 x	none	3

As shown on Table 2, the most inconsistently distributed among vowels is the schwa sound or the mid-central unrounded vowel [ə] which may surface as [o], [I], [a], or [əI] in the speech of both the newscasters and interlocutors studied. The [ə]-[o] substitution frequently takes place in the <u>(-) co-</u> combination:

c<u>o</u>llected	c<u>o</u>nservative
c<u>o</u>mmander	c<u>o</u>nsider
c<u>o</u>mplete	c<u>o</u>nsortium
c<u>o</u>mmission	c<u>o</u>nstabulary
c<u>o</u>nfirmed	rec<u>o</u>ver

Even the -or/ur(-) combination may cause the [ə]-[o] substitution to surface:

actors	prior
coordinator	Saturday
exhibitors	savored
favors	sponsorship
major	Thursday

Note the substitutions in the following words:

	PE	SAE
assumption	[ə'samšon][5]	[ə'semšən]
objection	[ob'jekšon]	[əb'jekšən]
question	['kwesčon]	['kwesčən]
fundamental	[fondə'mentəl]	[fəndə'mentəl]
multiple	['moltɨpoɨ]	['məltɨp(ə)ɨ]
supplies	[so'plaɨs]	[sə'playz]
support	[so'port]	[sə'pɔrt]
suspension	[sos'penšon]	[səs'pen šən]
customs	['kastoms]	['kəs təmz]
troubled	['trobold]	['trə bl̩d][6]

[5]The mark ' above the line and before a syllable indicates location of primary stress while the mark , below the line and before a syllable indicates location of secondary stress. Thus, the word corporation may be transcribed as [ˌkɔrpə'reyšən], the third syllable [rey] to be produced with greater intensity than the first, [kɔr]. In many instances, though, only the primary stress is indicated in the study.

[6]The short vertical line below a phonetic letter means that the letter is considered/pronounced as a syllabic consonant, a syllable without any vowel, the consonant in effect functioning as a vowel.

Note too the way the prepositions in phrases are pronounced:

	PE	SAE
among	[ə'mo̲ŋ]	[ə'me̲ŋ]
of	[ɔf] or [ɔv]	[əv]

Even if it comes before a word with an initial consonantal sound, the definite article the does not come out as [ðə] but as the partially unreduced form [ðɪ]: [ðɪ̲+'rɪyson][7] for the reason, [ðɪ̲+'trend] for the trend, and [ðɪ̲+tə'galog+'oʃens] for the Tagalog audience.

The non-definite article a, which should be pronounced as [ə] when used in a phrasal combination, does not surface as such but as [eɪ]: [eɪ̲+'vyuw] for a view, [eɪ̲+ˌpresen'teyšon] for a presentation, and [eɪ̲+ ˌpapyulər+'meθod] for a popular method.

One significance of the [ə]-[o], [ɪ], and [eɪ]substitution appears to be that vowel reduction, a feature of rapid or normal American English speech, still poses a difficulty for Filipino speakers of English, even the near native ones. Another meaningful observation worth repeating is that to a large extent, Filipino speakers of English still go by spelling pronunciation, which is evidently induced by their native language, which observes a phonetic system of spelling. The fact that Filipino speakers learn English from reading may have contributed to the spelling pronunciation features which characterize their speech.

---

[7]The plus symbol in a phonetic transcription indicates juncture of morphological or lexical forms.

In some instances, [ɐ] is pronounced as a low-central unrounded vowel [a] especially when it is stressed:

[kam] for come instead of [kɐm]

[dɪs'kas] for discuss instead of [dɪs'kɐs]

['fandɪŋ] for funding instead of ['fɐndɪŋ]

[Jambo] for jumbo instead of ['Jɐmbow]

[pals] for pulse instead of [pɐls]

Expectedly, the next most inconsistently distributed vowel is the low-front unrounded vowel [æ] for which the low-central unrounded vowel [a], which is present in all Philippine languages, is used as a substitute. Thus, the underlined letter in each of the following words may be heard as [a] instead of as [æ] in the speech of the speakers studied:

acting	classes	happened
after	established	handles
ambassador	example	mechanics
attitude	famine	panel
channel	graphic	rampant

The mid-back rounded vowel with a glide [ow] may have either [o] or even [ɔ] for its substitute, the substitutes alternating in such words as the following:

hold [howld] which may be pronounced either as [hold] or [hɔld]

jumbo which may be pronounced either as ['Jambo] or ['Jumbɔ] instead of as [Jambow]

moment which may come out iether as ['moment] or

[ˈmo̲ment] instead of as [ˈmo̲wment]

October which may be said either as [okˈto̲ber] or

[okˈtɔ̲ber] rather than as [ekˈto̲wber]

program which may be uttered either as [ˈpro̲gram]

or [ˈprɔ̲gram] rather than as [ˈpro̲wgram]

Where the tense high-front unrounded vowel [ɨy] is required, the speakers use the lax [ɨ].[8] Some of the words which may yield the [ɨy]-[ɨ] substitution are:

complete [kemˈpɨy̲t] which becomes [komˈpɨ̲t]

each [ɨy̲č] which becomes [ɨ̲č]

proceed [proˈsɨy̲d] or [preˈsɨy̲d] which becomes

[proˈsɨd]

speaking [ˈspɨy̲kɨŋ] which becomes [ˈspɨ̲kɨŋ]

these [ðɨy̲z] which becomes [d̪ɨ̲z]

The [e]-[a] substitution occurs only in the -ari/y combination as in the following words:

agrarian [eˈgre̲rɨen] which is said as [agˈraryan]

Hungarian [heŋˈgerɨen] which is said as [haŋˈga̲ryan]

military [ˈmɨlɨte̲rɨ] which is said as [mɨlɨˈta̲rɨ]

seminary [ˈsemɨne̲rɨ] which is said as [semɨˈna̲rɨ]

various [ˈve̲rɨes] which is said as [ˈva̲ryus]

---

[8]Surprisingly, the [ɨ]-[ɨy] substitution (living [ɨɨyɨŋ] uttered as [ˈɨɨyvɨŋ], little [ˈɨɨtɨ] uttered as [ˈɨɨytoɨ], pitcher [ˈpɨčer] uttered as [ˈpɨyčer], etc.) does not turn up in any of the speech samples, but the researchers believe it is still a feature (perhaps minor now in Philippine Mass Media English) of Spoken PE in other domains. Apparently, however, this is a feature of GAE which has been mastered by the speakers of the mass media and the educated elites. The reverse is not true, however, that is, the substitution of [ɨ] for [ɨy]. Undoubtedly, this is partially due to the first language, where a similar sound Tagalog [ɨ:] has an allophone [ɨ] in certain CVC environments (see Schacter & Otanes 1972).

Again, the [e]-[a] substitution may be the result of Filipino speakers' spelling pronunciation tendency, [e] being graphically represented as a.

In cases where the tense mid-front unrounded phoneme [ey] is needed, the lax counterpart [e] comes out:

[ə'velәbol] for available instead of [ə'veylәbl]

[lo'keted] for located instead of [lo(w)'keytld]

['mekiŋ] for making instead of ['meykiŋ]

['oke] for okay instead of ['owkey]

['rejistrešon] for registration instead of [,rejis'treyšen]

Apparently, the problem here is not that [ey] is absent from the phonology of Tagalog or the interlocutors' native language[9] but that the interlocutors tend to use a lax [e] in rapid speech.

Minor features under the vowel category, some of which may be considered idiolectal, are the following:

the [i]-[ai] substitution (e.g., invigorates [in'vigereyts] becoming [in'vaigereyts])

the [ey]-[ai] substitution (e.g., Kuwait [ku'weyt] becoming [ku'wait])

the [e]-[ey] substitution (e.g., warfare ['wɔrfer] pronounced as ['warfeyr])

the [ə]-[e] substitution (e.g., carried ['kərid] pronounced as ['kerid])

---

[9]Note that as presented on Table 2, no one among the newscasters uses the [ey]-[e] substitution for at least three times. Actually, only one of them, a minor newscaster, used it once, a fact which may be explained as understandable, newscasters being more careful in their articulation than interlocutors.

the [ə]-[au] substitution (e.g., country [ˈkəntrɪ] produced as [ˈkauntrɪ])

the [ɔ] -[au] substitution (e.g., audition [ɔˈdɪšən] produced as [auˈdɪšon])

the [a]or[ɔ] -[o] substitution (e.g., honor [ˈanər] or [ˈɔnər] coming out as [ˈonor])

the [æ] - [ə] substitution (e.g., fact [fækt] coming out as [fəkt])

the [uw] - [u] substitution (e.g., wounded [ˈwuwndɪd] surfacing as [ˈwundɪd])

the [ɔ]-[ə] substitution (e.g., because [bɪˈkɔz] surfacing as [bɪˈkəs])

the [ɔ]-[a] substitution (e.g., launched [lɔnčt] uttered as [lanč]

the [ə]-[ey] substitution (e.g., a song [ə+ˈsɔŋ] uttered as [ey+ˈsoŋ])

Obviously, substitutions like [ey]-[aɪ] (where Kuwait is pronounced as [kuˈwaɪt]), [ə] -[au] (country being produced as [ˈkauntrɪ]), [ɔ] - [au] (audition being produced as [auˈdɪšon]), [a] or [ɔ] - [o] (honor coming out as [ˈonor]), and [ə]-[ey] (the non-definite article a in a phrase being uttered as [ey]: a song) are spelling pronunciation phenomena. The [ɪ]-[aɪ] (invigorates becoming [ɪnˈvaɪgoreyts]) and [ə]-[ey] (warfare pronounced as [ˈwarfeyr]) substitutions, on the other hand, may just be the result of analogy, a situation where a word is associated with another for pronunciation, spelling, etc. Note that the sample word invigorates for the [ɪ]-[aɪ]sub-

stitution is similar to such words as vitalize and vitamin for its -vi- combination, but the vi- combination in the last two words is pronounced as [vay]. The sample word warfare for the [e]-[ey] substituttion, on the other hand, is analogous to such words as date and rate for its -fare combination. By analogy, therefore, the -fare combination may be said with the same vowel quality as date [deyt] and rate [reyt].

Pronunciations like ['kerid] for carried and ['merid] for married are examples of hypercorrect forms, the reason being the failure to distinguish between the quality of the low-front unrounded vowel [æ] and that of the mid-front unrounded vowel [e]. Other examples of hypercorrect forms are the following:

['eydəm] for Adam ['keybin] for cabin

['eypoy] for apple ['deynyel] for Daniel

Just like the [ey]-[e] substitution (where okay ['owkey] comes out as ['oke]), the [uw]-[u] substitution occurs not because [uw] is absent from the phonology of Tagalog or the speakers' native language but because the speakers tend to use the lax [u] in rapid speech.

The [æ]-[e] substitution (where a word like fact [fækt] does not surface as the expected [fæk(t)], the usual substitute pronunciation, but as [fek(t)] seems to be a regional peculiarity among speakers whose native language is Ilocano.

It may be difficult to explain the occurrence of the [ɔ]-[e] (because surfacing as [bi'kes]) and [ɔ]-[a] (launched uttered as [lanč]) substitutions, but *apparently*, the problem

here arises from the difficulties in producing the lax mid-back rounded vowel [ɔ], which is absent from the phonological inventory of the Philippine languages.

Curiously, the [u]-[uw] substitution (pull vs. pool, full vs. fool, should vs. shoed, book vs. boot), which the researchers expected to surface, is not observable in the speech of any of the speakers. However, the researchers believe that just like the [ɪ]-[ɪy] substitution, which is neither observable in the speech of any of the speakers studied, the [u]-[uw] substitution is still a feature (perhaps minor too) of Spoken Philippine English in other domains.

2.4.1.3. Consonants

TABLE 3 Consonants Substituted for, their Substitutes, Frequency of Substitution, and Total Number of Newscasters and Interlocutors Using the Substitutions at Least Three Times

Consonants	Substitute(s)	Frequency of Substitution	Total Number of Newscasters Using the Substitution at Least Three Times	Total Number of Interlocutors Using the Substitution at Least Three Times
z	s	632 x	22	30
t (initial)	t (non-aspirated)	268 x	14	25
ð	d	137 x	11	20
t (final)	ø[10] (only in CC#)	93 x	9	8

[10] ø is used to represent an absent/unpronounced sound.
# indicates final position.
CC indicates double consonants.

Consonants	Substitute(s)	Frequency of Substitution	Total Number of Newscasters Using the Substitution at Least Three Times	Total Number of Interlocutors Using the Substitution at Least Three Times
f	p	35 x	3	3
θ	t	30 x	3	1
v	b	22 x	3	1

Predictably, the consonant whose distribution in certain lexical items is the most inconsistent is the voiced alveolar fricative [z]. As shown on the above table, a considerable number of newscasters and interlocutors substitute the voiceless fricative [s] for [z]. Although the speakers may be capable of producing the voiced alveolar fricative,[11] they substitute the voiceless counterpart in a number of instances, the number decidedly making the substitution a distinctive feature of Spoken Philippine English. It is significant to note that while the [z]-[s] substitution may occur in medial position:

business	president
chosen	realizing
designers	reason
observers	resolve
physical	verbalization

[11] The researchers have observed a number of instances where some Filipino speakers say [z] where [s] is required (e.g., this [ðɪs] coming out as [ðɪyz], dissertation [dɪsərˈteyšən] coming out as [dɪzərˈteyšən], increasing [ɪŋˈkrɪysɪŋ] coming out as [ɪŋˈkrɪzɪŋ], and Miss [mɪs] coming out as [mɪz]. These may be instances of hypercorrection.

it is most frequent in final position especially when it is used as a plural or third person singular marker:

advantages	idols	recognize
as	industries	relations
because	is	rentals
comes	items	seas
exhibitions	materials	shows
has	Philippines	those

Seldom does the [z]-[s] substitution occur in initial position. To some extent, this feature may be another spelling pronunciation phenomenon, the [z] sound being often graphically represented as s in these instances.

The aspirated initial alveolar stop allophone [t^h] surfaces as the next most consistently unused consonantal sound. Such words as time, to, together, tonight, and topic, for example, may be frequently heard as [taɪm], [tu], [tu'gedər], [tu'naɪt], and ['tapɪk] instead of as [t^haɪm], [t^hu], [t^hu'geðər], [t^hu'naɪt], and [t^hapɪk] respectively.

The dental fricatives [ð] and [θ] are changed to the alveolar stops [d] and [t] respectively, although as Table 3 indicates, the [ð-d] substitution is much more frequent than [θ]-[t] substitution.[12]

although [ɔl'ðow] pronounced as [ɔl'do]

farther ['farðər] pronounced as ['fardər]

---

[12]Again, this is to be expected since [ð] occurs more frequently than [θ] in English usage.

that [ðæt] pronounced as [dæt]

then [ðen] pronounced as [den]

this [ðɪs] pronounced as [dɪs]

fifth [fɪfθ] produced as [fɪft]

north [nɔrθ] produced as [nort]

sixth [sɪksθ] produced as [sɪkst]

south [sauθ] produced as [saut]

three [θrɪy] produced as [trɪy]

The [f]-[p] and [v]-[b] substitutions, which have always plagued a number of speech teachers, is still noticeable in the speech of some speakers. Interestingly, though, the number of speakers who made the substitution at least three times was small (three among the newscasters for the [f]-[p] and [v]-[b] substitutions and among the interlocutors, three for the [f]-[p] substitutions and only one for the [v]-[b] substitution). Examples of words which are subject to the [f]-[p] substitution are:

after	if
factories	offices
five	referendum
form	successful
from	therefore

Examples of words which show the [v]-[b] substitution are:

activities	over
boulevard	November
however	province
investments	survivors
level	voting

Quite expectedly, final [t] and [d] pose a difficulty for a number of speakers only when these occur in clusters (for [t]: [pt(s)], [kt(s)], [čt], [ft], [st], and [št]; for [d]: [gd], [Jd], [vd], and [zd]). Both [t] and [d] in final position are left out in words such as the following:

handicapped	established
accept(s)	plagued
reached	changed
aircraft	involved
based	closed

Noteworthy about this feature of Spoken Philippine English is the following observation made by an English teacher (Porter 1978:9):

> Many sounds that are produced when a word is pronounced in isolation are obliterated when the word occurs in normal connected speech, even though they may carry important grammatical information. . . When the following word begins with a consonant, the /t/ or /d/ marking the grammatical distinction is regularly dropped in normal speech: advanced method [ədˈvɑ:nsˈmɛθəd], stressed vowel [ˈstrɛsˈvaʊəl], loved fishing [ˈlʌvˈfɪšɪŋ], kept coming [ˈkɛpˈkʌmɪŋ]. The fact that the native speaker can omit [t] and [d] in these circumstances shows that the transmission of accurate meaning is in no way impaired as a result.

The problem among Filipino speakers, however, is that they tend to drop the final /t/ or /d/ phoneme whether it is followed by a word beginning with a consonant sound or not.

Thus, the phrase handicapped in many ways surfaces as [ˌhandɪkapt+ɪn+ˈmenɪ+weys] in the speech of one speaker studied. On the other hand, where loss of segmentals is called for in rapid speech, Filipino speakers do not do it (e.g., a reason often comes out as [ˌey+ˈrɪyson], not [ə+ˈrɪyz(ə)n] while physically attractive also often comes out as [ˌfɪsɪkalɪ+əˈtraktɪv] instead of the conversational [ˌfɪzɪkɪl+əˈ traktɪv] in Filipino speakers' speech) and where loss of segmental is not called for, apocope and syncope often take place (e.g., associate [əˈsowšɪɪt] pronounced as [ˈasošɪt] and radio [ˈreydɪo(w)] as [ˈreyɹo]).

Minor features under the consonant category are the [ž]-[š] and [š]-[s] substitutions. Words such as illusion [ɪɪˈyuwžən], revision [rɪˈvɪžən], and television [teɪəˈvɪžən] may be heard as [ɪɪˈyuwšon], [rɪˈvɪšon], and [teɪəˈvɪšon] respectively,[13] while such words as she [šɪy] and accomplished [əˈkamplɪšt] may emerge as [sɪy] and [əˈkamplɪs]. The first substitution is akin to the [z]-[s] substitution, the lack of voicing contrast in fricatives. The [š]-[s] substitution is explainable by the fact that [š] does not generally occur among the Philippine languages.

2.4.1.4. Consonant-Vowel Combinations

Another feature of Spoken Philippine English is the tendency of some speakers to reduce two-syllable combinations

---

[13]We suspect that this feature is systemic; its infrequent occurrence in the data (and therefore inclusion as a minor rather than a major feature) is explainable by the relative infrequency in English usage of lexical items with [ž].

to one-syllable combinations, the reduction usually resulting in the production of another sound (often an affricate). Although this feature of Philippine English is minor as far as the data yielded by this study are concerned, it may eventually become distinctive (in fact, using more data than that employed by the study, this feature may be investigated further by any language researcher to find out the extent of its occurrence in Philippine English). Examples of this feature are the following:

GAE FORMS	PE FORMS
[dɪ.e] or [dɪ.e][14] (e.g., ingredient [ɪn'gridɪənt], obedient [o'bidɪənt], guardian ['gardɪən])	[je] or [je] (e.g., ingredient [ɪn'griyjent], obedient [o'biydjent], guardian ['garjan])
[dɪ.o(w)] (e.g., radio ['reydɪo(w)]	[ju] or [jo] (e.g., radio ['reyju] or [reyjo]
[ču.e] (e.g., actually ['akčuelɪ] or ['akčulɪ], conceptualizing [kon'sepčuelaɪzɪŋ])	[čwa] or [twa] (e.g., actually ['akčwalɪ] or ['aktwalɪ], conceptualizing [kon'sepčwalaɪsɪŋ] or [kon'septwalaɪsɪŋ])
[prɪ.ɪ] (e.g., appropriate [ə'prowprɪɪt])	[pre(y)] (e.g., appropriate ['apropre(y)t])
[ju.e] (e.g., individual [ɪndɪ'vɪjuel] or [ɪndɪ'vɪjul])	[jwa] or [dwa] (e.g., individual [ɪndɪ'vɪjwal] or [ɪndɪ'vɪdwal])
[ɪɪ.ey] (e.g., humiliation [hyumɪɪ'eyšen])	[ɪye(y)] (e.g., humiliation [yumɪɪ'ye(y)šon])
[yu.ey] (e.g., evacuated ['vakyueytɪd], evaluation [ɪvaɪyu'eyšen])	[we(y)] (e.g., evacuated ['vakwe(y)tɪd] or ['ɪyvakwe(y)tɪd], evaluation [ɪvaɪ'we(y)šon]) or ['ɪyvaɪwe(y)šon])

[14] A period between two segments indicates syllabic division. In this section, the mark is used only to call attention to the contrast/difference between the GAE and the PE forms. Phonetic transcriptions of lexical items usually leave it out.

GAE FORMS	PE FORMS
[šu.e] (e.g., sexual [ˈsekšuəl])	[swa] (e.g., sexual [ˈsekswal])
[šl.ey] or [šl.l] (e.g., associate [əsowšleyt] or [əˈsowsllt])	[syey] or [syl] (e.g. associate [ˈasosyeyt] or [ˈasosylt])
[žu.e] or [žu] or [že] (e.g., usually [ˈyuwžuəll] or [ˈyuwžull] or [ˈyuwžell])	[zwa] or [swa] (e.g., usually [ˈyuwzwall] or [ˈyuwswall])

These processes reflect phonological rules of the Philippine languages which a systematic analysis using a process model will undoubtedly yield:

Affrication

GAE	ˈreydl.ow	GAE	ˈgar.dl.en	(Spelling Pronunciation)
PE	ˈrey J o (Affrication)	PE	ˈgar J an	(Affrication)

De-Affrication and Vowel Syncope

GAE	ˈak.ču.wal	
	ˈak.ču.wal	(Spelling Pronunciation)
	ˈak.tu.wal	(De-Affrication)
PE	ˈak.t wal	(Vowel Syncope)

Vowel Syncope

	əˈpro.prl.lt	
	a.pro.prl.eyt	(Spelling Pronunciation)
	ˈa.pro.prl.eyt	(Stress Shift)
PE	ˈa.pro.pr eyt	(Vowel Syncope)

Consonantization (Vowel to Glide)

GAE	hyu.ˌmll.l.ˈey.šən	
	hyu.ˌmll.l.ˈey.šon	(Spelling Pronunciation)
	ˈhyu.mll.l.ey.šon	(Stress Shift)
PE	ˈhyu.mll.y ey.šon	(Consonantization)

Consonantal Declustering

GAE	i.,va.kyu.'ey.šon	
	e.,va.kyu.'ey.šon	(Spelling Pronunciation)
	'e.va.kyu.ey.šon	(Stress Shift)
	'e.va.ku.ey.šon	(Declustering)
PE	'e.va.kwey.šon	(Consonantization)

Where a letter in a combination is silent, some speakers give it a phonetic equivalent, again a consequence of spelling pronunciation, and then make it a consonant plus glide sequence. Words such as pier [p|(ə)r], pierces ['p|(ə)rs|z], and premier [pr|'m|(ə)r], therefore, may come out as [py|r], ['py|rs|s], and [pr|'my|r]. On the other hand, where a combination requires all its letters to be pronounced, each one of them having a phonetic equivalent, some speakers may leave out a sound. Thus, the combination -quo- [kwow] may be reduced to [ko(w)] and -gui [gw|] may surface as [g|] (e.g., quoted becomes ['ko(w)t|d] and distinguish [d|s't|ŋg|s]).

Combinations with possible syllabic consonants such as [p(ə)l], [b(ə)l], [t(ə)l], [d(ə)l], [k(ə)l], [g(ə)l], and [f(ə)l] may be heard as [pol], [bol], [tol], [dol], [kol], [gol], and [fol] respectively. Examples of words which show this feature are the following:

people	middle	rifle
able	ankle	
beetle	single	

In effect, what happens to the above words is that the possible syllabic l [l̩] is considered a consonant and the optional [ə]

is said as an [o], the closest equivalent of the mid-central unrounded vowel in English being the Philippine back central rounded vowel, *in this context.*

2.4.1.6. Word Stress

TABLE 4 Stress Shifting in Philippine English, Its Frequency of Occurrence, and the Total Number of Newscasters and Interlocutors Making the Shift at Least Three Times

Location of Primary Stress	Syllable to Which Primary Stress is Shifted	Frequency of Shifting	Total Number of Newscasters Making the Shift at Least Three Times	Total Number of Interlocutors Making the Shift at Least Three Times
second syllable	first syllable	48 x	7	none
third syllable	first syllable	178 x	15	6
fourth syllable	first syllable	40 x	4	none
	second syllable	38 x	5	1

The most discernible feature in the stress pattern of the speakers studied is the tendency to shift the primary stress to the syllable which ordinarily receives the secondary stress in -tion-suffixed words made up of at least four syllables. Thus, words such as conversation, corporation,

delegation, liberation, and operation, the primary stress of which is ordinarily placed on the syllable just before the -tion suffix (conser'vation, corpo'ration, dele'gation, libe'ration, ope'ration), are said with the primary stress shifted to the first syllable ('conservation, 'corporation, 'delegation, 'liberation, 'operation). Five-syllable -tion-suffixed words such as association (associ'ation), commemoration (commemo'ration), deterioration (deterio'ration), confederation (confede'ration), organization (organi'zation), and unification (unifi'cation) follow the same stress-shifting pattern, the primary stress again being placed wherever the secondary stress is found. Thus, one hears the five-syllable words above uttered as as'sociation (sometimes 'association), com'memoration, de'terioration, con'federation (sometimes 'confederation'), 'organization (sometimes or'ganization), and 'unification. Even certain non-tion-suffixed words such as comprehensive, presidential, democratic, economic, and paralytic occasionally follow the primary stress-shifted-to-the secondary stress pattern. Thus, instead of hearing compre'hensive , presi'dential , demo'cratic , eco'nomic , and para'lytic , one may hear 'comprehensive , 'presidential , 'democratic , 'economic , and 'paralytic .

Where the primary stress is commonly placed on the second syllable, some of the speakers shift it to the first syllable where the secondary stress is normally found:

al'though becoming 'although

an'tique becoming 'antique

fif'teen becoming 'fifteen

Ko'rea becoming 'Korea

ty'phoon becoming 'typhoon

Where the primary stress should be placed on the third syllable, the speakers shift it to the first syllable where, again, the secondary stress should be placed (as mentioned earlier, conser'vation becomes 'conservation , libe'ration 'liberation'). Where the primary stress is ordinarily placed on the fourth syllable, the speakers may put it on either the first or the second syllable, depending upon the location of the secondary stress (again, as mentioned earlier, confede'ration and unifi'cation may surface as 'confederation and 'unification while associ'ation and commemo'ration may be heard as as'sociation and com'memoration, respectively).

Minor stress features of Philippine English are the following:

(1) the first syllable-to-the-second syllable primary stress shift ('candidacy uttered as can'didacy , 'content [noun], con'tent ; 'honorable , ho'norable , subsequent , sub'sequent)

(2) the first syllable-to-the-third syllable primary stress shift ('secretary surfacing as secre'tary , 'military , mili'tary).

(3) the second syllable-to-the-third syllable primary stress shift (de'termine produced as deter'mine , e'vacuees , eva'cuees [sometimes 'evacuees]).

(4) the third syllable-to-the-second syllable primary stress shift (awar'dees coming out as a'wardees , devo-'tees de'votees)

(5) the third syllable-to-the-fourth syllable primary stress shift (parlia'mentary pronounced as parliamen'tary)

(6) the third syllable-to-the-fifth syllable primary stress shift (bene'ficiary uttered as benefici'ary).[15]

2.4.1.7. Rhythm and Sentence Stress

The prevalence of spelling pronunciations and the concomitant lack of the vowel reduction rule in Spoken Philippine English gives almost equal value, in terms of duration, to each syllable, thus leading to a tendency towards syllable-timed speech instead of American English stress-timed speech.

In this aspect one must content oneself with an overall impression, since the extent of syllable-timing as opposed to stress-timing varies from speaker to speaker.

---

[15] Not in the corpus but observed quite often during station identification is the accentual pattern for the designation of a station:

PE	GAE
The Bíg Óne	The Bíg Òne

The semantic differenees in GAE are quite marked: The Bíg Òne refers to something big, a compound noun; The Bíg Óne refers to a big figure one, a modified head noun. In PE, the meaning of The Bíg Óne is the former, not the latter.

There is undoubtedly a correlation between the occurrence of the vowel reduction rule (unstressed vowels become schwa) and stress timing. In speakers where the vowel reduction rule is not part of competence or where it occurs only in limited contexts, there will naturally exist a tendency to syllable-timing and to syllable length more or less equal to or at least of longer duration than the unstressed syllables of American English.

Moreover, the peak syllable in a clause, seemingly characteristic of American English, does not seem to receive the same prominence in Philippine English.

This section on rhythm and sentence stress is based on impressions and will need instrumentation for empirical verification.

2.4.1.8. Intonation

TABLE 5 Final Intonation Features of Philippine English, their Frequency of Occurrence, and Total Number of Newscasters and Interlocutors Using the Features at Least Three Times

Linguistic Unit	Final Intonation Feature	Frequency of Occurrence	Total Number of Newscasters Using the Feature at Least Three Times	Total Number of Interlocutors Using the Feature at Least Three Times
Statements	Sustained High Pitch	34 x	1	6
Clauses	Sustained High Pitch	50 x	1	9
Phrases	Sustained High Pitch	48 x	2	11
Yes/no questions	Low Pitch	9 x	none	3
WH questions	Sustained High Pitch	14 x	none	3

An interesting intonational feature of a number of statements, clauses, and phrases uttered by the interlocutors and some of the newscasters is the seemingly British way in which they are ended. This is characterized by a sustained high pitch as the stressed syllable and the syllables following it of the last content word are said. Thus, sentences like 'It's Friday night once again, and welcome to the late hour show', 'She's the general manager and Vice-President of Power Business Corporation', and 'I'd like to thank our special guest this evening' may be heard with the following intonational contour:[16]

It's Friday night once a⌈gain, and welcome to the late hour ⌈show

She's the general ⌈manager and Vice-President of Power Business Corpo⌈ration

I'd like to thank the special guest this ⌈evening

Clauses such as 'And as you can see . . .', '. . . because there is an audience . . .', and '. . . that was held here in Manila' may be said with the following intonation contour:

And as you can ⌈see. . .

. . .because there is an ⌈audience. . .

. . .that was held here in Ma⌈nila

[16] Lines are used to represent intonation. The line placed under a word/syllable or words/syllables means middle pitch level; that placed above a word/syllable or words/syllables means high pitch level; and that found lower than the middle pitch level line represents low pitch level.

Phrases such as 'my youngest son', 'all these things', and 'commission on elections' may surface as follows:

my youngest ⌈son
all these ⌈things
Commission on ⌈Elections

Note that the table on PE final intonation features shows an insignificant number of newscasters observed to be using the sustained high pitch at least three times in the final utterance of statements, clauses, and phrases. The reason for this could be that the communication situation newscasters find themselves in--reading mostly impersonal, matter-of-fact sentences--does not encourage much deviation from the usual (American) mid-high-low intonation contour for utterances other than yes/no questions. Even among the interlocutors observed to be using the final sustained high intonational feature, the traditional mid-high-low or rising-falling intonation, which is considered a universal linguistic feature for declarative sentences, is used off and on. Occasionally, too, yes/no questions which are ordinarily uttered with a mid-high or rising intonation in most languages may be heard with a mid-high-low or rising-falling intonation in the speech of some interlocutors:

Is it possible for the Comelec to publicly announce the location of the special election registrars' offices in Metro Manila so they can proceed to these offices to ⌈register ?

Is there a possibility that these areas which you mentioned will not be allowed to participate in the coming referendum this December seventeen because of the activities of the terrorists in these ⌈areas⌋?

Is acupuncture in any way similar to or a completely different thing from faith ⌈healing⌋?

The shift from the rising to the rising-falling intonation for some yes/no questions uttered by some interlocutors seems to occur only when the sentences are relatively long. When a yes/no question, however, is short, such as 'Is it good?' or 'Do you work?' it is uttered with a mid-high or rising intonation.

Some wh-questions were observed to follow the mid-high sustained intonation instead of the mid-high-low or falling intonation, as in the following examples:

What is the reason for the ⌈referendum?

Why was this ⌈change?

What arrangement do you have with the ⌈exhibitors?

Since only one of the speakers studied uttered quoted sentences (two questions), a definitive statement about the terminal intonational contours of quoted endings cannot be made. The two questions, however, follow the mid-high intonation:

She asks, 'How about young ⌈people?'

She asked, 'How is it that you can prevent them from early ⌈separation?'

2.4.2. Lexical Features

TABLE 6 Distinctive Lexical Features of Spoken Philippine English, Their Frequency of Occurrence, and Total Number of Interlocutors Using the Features at Least Three Times

Lexical Features	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Interlocutors Using the Features at Least Three Times
the use of the expression no? after words, phrases, clauses, and statements	38 x	5
the use of different prepositions	13 x	4
the use of the word doctora	11 x	3
the addition of the adverb already	10 x	3
the use of unusual terms and collocations	9 x	3

The features to be discussed in this section were taken exclusively from the talk-shows; they did not occur in the newscasts, which were written beforehand and edited.

Definitely a noticeable feature of the utterances produced by the interlocutors is the use of the expression no? (which should not be mistaken for the English adverb of negation) after words, phrases, clauses, and statements. Thus, utterances such as

the following occurred in the speech of some of the interlocutors:

aligned, no?

marriage, no?

urban dwellers, no?

especially Filipino men, no?

there could have been another change, no?

yes, we have a lot of dancers and singers, no?

that should have been made clear, June, no?

Curiously, the expression is not always uttered with one kind of pitch but with two kinds: high (especially Filipino men, no?) and middle (that should have been made clear, June, no?). The use of the high pitch is intended to seek confirmation (therefore roughly equivalent to one type of tag question in English), while the middle pitch, although also used as a confirmation marker, may signal 'commentative' (when Tagalog is mixed with English, the expression ano? or hindi ba? may be used in place of no?).

In instances where some verbs or (pro)nouns require special prepositions to convey certain meanings, some of the interlocutors change the particles. Examples of this feature are the following:

I pick out the best in [from][17] the modern.

So therefore, if acupuncture does not work in [with] that particular individual, we do not guarantee also.

[17] SAE Forms are enclosed in brackets.

It's their turn to ask questions from [of] each other.

I learned another language in [on] my last trip.

Perhaps wishing to distinguish between a female doctor from a male doctor (obviously because of Spanish influence), some of the interlocutors use the word doctora instead of doctor to address a female doctor; this practice is widespread, even among speakers who were program hosts and whose English showed near-native American English features.

The adverb already appears in certain utterances, the contexts of which does not call for the use of the word. The explanation given by a number of teachers for the addition of the adverb is that it translates the Philippine word na, which signifies perfection or completion of work, action, or activity (the English already implies 'sooner than expected'). Apparently, Filipino speakers feel the need to use na in producing utterances touching on work/action/activity which is perfected or completed and carry this over to English when referring to to the same work/action/activity . Observe the following sentences which use already:

Right now, it is accepted already.

Then, we can already start selling the product.

In other words, we shift very substantially already to full parliamentary system.

Imagine, you're already living together.

Another distinctive lexical feature of Spoken Philippine English is the use of unusual terms or collocations.[18] Examples occurring in the speech of some interlocutors are the following:

aggrupation [group]

cope up with problems [cope with problems]

continue availing of their services [continue availing themselves/oneself/himself/herself yourself/yourselves/ourselves of the services]

anti-pollutionary device [anti-pollution device]

dig down into the cause [dig into the cause]

Other unusual terms and collocations which occurred but did not meet the stipulated frequency are the following:

(1) could preference

I could probably answer that. [I can probably answer that.]

(2) use of prepositions after certain transitive verbs

We were discussing about that.

[We were discussing that.]

(3) use of common words with an uncommon meaning

Those people, therefore, who were not able to register because of lack of forms would still have some remedy?

---

[18] Teodoro Llamzon (1969) calls these Filipinisms. Some expressions he lists as examples are: 'I will pass by for you' [I will pick you up], 'I will go ahead' [See you], 'Your dress is nice' [Your dress is strikingly beautiful/remarkable], 'He is my relative' [He is related to me], 'My head/tooth is painful' [I have a headache/toothache], 'My friend lives across my house' [My friend lives opposite my home] 'Close/Open the light' [Turn off/on the light], 'My friend wants to go down the bus' [My friend wants to get off the bus], 'lie on bed' [lie in bed], 'I slept late yesterday' [I stayed up late last night], and 'Wait a while' [(Wait) a minute].

For a more thorough listing of Filipinisms, see Dar 1973.

[Those people, therefore, who were not able to register because of lack of forms would still have another chance?]

(4) unusual use of wherein

I had a patient wherein the patient could not open the door of the car.

[I had a patient who could not open the door of the car.]

(5) preference for the one

Virtue should be the one to determine chastity.

(6) use of yes to answer a negatively phrased question

It is not a total cure? Yes [it is not a total cure.]

(7) addition of like to look

Maybe, you can give us an idea of how they look like.

[Perhaps you can give us an idea of how they look.][19]

(8) use of also in a negative utterance

If acupuncture does not work in that particular individual, we cannot guarantee also [either].

(9) omission of prepositions from certain phrasal verbs

We would like to ask Chairman Perez a sort of a brief report on the result of the registration.

[We would like to ask Chairman Perez for a sort of a brief report on the result of the registration.]

(10) use of or/and before etc.

Whether you have been defiled through rape or etcetera, etcetera . . .

---

[19] This collocation is probably confused with the question 'What do they look like?'.

(11) indiscriminate use of and

Yes, this case of Parkinson, and there is also the post CVA cases, and they respond very well.

(12) preference for of to express personal possession

There was a general belief of the people, because of a previous announcement of the president, that there will be a presidential election.

2.4.2.2. Syntactic Features

Under syntactic features are a series of constructions (thirty-four occurrences in the speech of nine interlocutors) which exhibit different types of violations of concord/ governance rules in SAE:

(1) unclear relation between the subject and the predicate because of other remarks in-between

The first thing you have to do is look at the, you know, you have to examine your patient before...ahh...to be sure that there [a little pause] the patient would be able, at least you have to condition the patient in the sense that this kind of anesthesia will be given to you. . .

Bust chastity, as a father, I'd say it is still pretty held high, you know, in the regard of many people.

(2) main-subordinate clause incongruence

Because if you are chaste, it reflects on your personality.

(3) pronoun-referent/antecedent incongruence

Only that...ah...number one for a girl is she should be faithful to your boyfriend or to your husband, and that means that you should be trusted

anywhere you are.

Since these instances of concord/governance violation are found in the speech of educated interlocutors who evidently have been exposed to English for a long time and since these violations are found even among American speakers, it is doubtful whether these can be distinctive for Philippine English. It would seem that in spontaneous unedited speech, such violations are a matter of common occurrence, instances of performance failure rather than of competence.

Other syntactic features which occurred but did not meet our criteria for frequency and are therefore considered as minor are the following:

(1) subject-verb inversion in indirect questions

There have been inquiries about what will they buy from the auction sale, Commissioner.

(2) addition of the definite article

With respect to the use of the television and radio. . .

(3) omission of indefinite article after such

Some reasons have been given as to why there is no need for such referendum [such a referendum].

(4) non-plural nouns after one of

One of the cause [causes] of separation . . .

(5) pluralization of adjectival nouns

It is a five-elements [five-element] theory.

(6) slot-filler incongruence in word class

We tend to be machismo [macho] .

2.5. Summary

We have tried to describe the distinctive features of Spoken Philippine English in the mass media based on the criteria that only speech forms uttered at least three times by at least three different speakers would be included as distinctive. These features, classified under various categories, are as follows:

Phonological Features

a different distribution of segments in various lexical items

the absence of the vowel reduction rule and a tendency to pronounce words as they are spelled

substitution of [a] for [æ], [ɔ] or [o] for [ow]

[ɨ] for [iy], [e] for [ɛ], [e] for [ey]

substitution of voiceless fricatives for voiced fricatives

absence of aspiration of initial voiceless stops

substitution of [d] for [ð]

substitution of [p] for [f], [t] for [θ], [b] for [v]

simplification of consonant clusters in final position

shift of the primary stress to a syllable that would normally receive only the secondary stress

different stress patterns in individual words

a tendency towards syllable-timed rhythm

sustained high pitch for statements, clauses, phrases, wh-questions

falling intonation for yes-no questions

Lexical Features

the use of no? after words, phrases, clauses, statements

the use of different prepositions

the use of the title doctora

the addition of the adverb already

the use of unusual terms and collocations

Syntactic Features

non-observance of usual concord/governance rules for subject-predicate, main-subordinate clause, pronoun-referent

3. Written Philippine English of the Mass Media

3.1. Purpose

3.2. Sampling and Corpus

3.3. Operational Criteria for Inclusion as a Distinctive Feature

3.4. Categories

3.4.1. Lexical Features

3.4.1.1. Preference for Specific Words and Collocations

3.4.1.2. Unusual Words and Collocations

3.4.1.3. Unusual Prepositional Usage

3.4.1.4. Minor Lexical Features

3.4.2. Syntactic Features

3.4.2.1. Word Order (Object-Adverb Sequence)

3.4.2.2. Use of Articles

3.4.2.3. Noun Sub-Categorization

3.4.2.4. Pronoun-Antecedent Incongruence

3.4.2.5. Subject-Predicate Incongruence

3.4.2.6. Verb Sub-Categorization

3.4.2.7. Tense-Aspect Usage

3.4.2.8. Minor Features

3.5. Summary

3. Written Philippine English of the Mass Media

3.1. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to set down the distinctive features of Written Philippine English of the mass media based on specific criteria using a set corpus of printed samples.

As with Spoken Philippine English, using Written American English as a basis for comparison, the features to be listed would be considered either unusual because they are specific to Philippine usage or because they are considered irregular since they violate certain rules of American English syntax.

By and large, most languages are open to loan words, which could be single words or phrases or even expressions or loan translations having direct reference to aspects of the culture to which a foreign language has been transplanted. Most native speakers of the transplant language would consider such loans acceptable and perfectly expectable although initially unusual.

Less acceptable and frowned upon by prescriptive grammarians and teachers are patent errors of usage or grammar. However, as with the features set down for Spoken Philippine English, we must repeat the principle that language change comes about in most cases because a specific rule has been added, modified, or even dropped in the language, initially by an individual or a group of individuals. What will spell its eventual acceptability and hence incorporation into the language will be its acceptance by the larger community. Under

certain circumstances, once accepted, the feature becomes the standard rather than the anomaly.

Again, assuming that the writers of newspapers and magazines of the Philippine mass media are educated and belong to the elite, at least, the writing elite, one must assume that the usages of these writers through the constant exposure of their writing in news stories, features, columns, editorials, will find acceptance among the readers of such printed matter and that after a while the usages (including violations of prescriptive grammar) will eventually become rules for the language of a particular society which has appropriated the language for its use. It is in this light that we have considered the writers from whose articles we drew the sample; these writers function as models who will eventually provide the standards for written English in the Philippines.

As bases for comparison, we have used the codification of American English Grammar as found in Praninskas (1961) and Francis (1958 and 1967) as well as the notations of Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) on American English.

4.2. Sampling and Corpus

Fourteen publications (eight newspapers and six magazines) were studied. Six of the newspapers (Bulletin Today, Daily Express, Times Journal, Evening Express, Evening Post and Business Day) are published daily, while two others (Sports World and Economic Monitor) appear weekly. The magazines (Panorama, Expressweek, Focus, Mod, Mr. and Ms., and Woman's Home Companion) are published weekly. Only one

issue of each of the above-mentioned newspapers and magazines was studied. Table 1 lists the dates and the publications analyzed.

TABLE 1 Lists of Issues of Publications Analyzed, Number of Sentences Studied in Each Issue, Number of Distinctive Philippine Features Observed

Newspaper/Magazine	Issue	Number of Sentences Studied [1]	Number of Philippine Features Observed
Bulletin Today	December 16, 1977	731	206
Daily Express	September 3, 1977	734	215
Times Journal	December 22, 1977	541	105
Evening Express	January 1, 1978	209	76
Evening Post	December 19, 1977	259	48
Business Day	December 22, 1977	247	73
Sports World	January 6-13, 1978	473	47
Economic Monitor	January 9, 1978	561	189
Panorama	December 11, 1977	735	52
Expressweek	December 13, 1977	832	102
Focus	January 1, 1978	760	57
Mod	January 20, 1978	1,224	138
Mr. and Ms.	January 17, 1978	551	86
Woman's Home Companion	January 26, 1978	759	42

It will be seen from the above table that the issues were selected at random over several months (September 1977 to January 1978).

[1] A sentence was defined in graphic terms, a sequence of words beginning with a capital letter and ending with a period, with two spaces separating it from the following sentence .

The same table shows the number of sentences studied in each issue of the newspapers and magazines used as data together with the number of features observed.

All forms of prose were considered in the data for analysis, news stories, columns, editorials, features, letters to the editor, photo captions, and short stories. Excluded from the analysis were advertisements (which have a style all their own) and foreign-authored news stories as well as columns, editorials, features, essays, letters to the editor, photo captions and short stories, from international syndicates.

As with the spoken sample, there was an original attempt to separate formal from informal writing.[2] Classified under formal writing were news stories, editorials, columns (except columns dealing with entertainment), features, essays, and short stories (including those constructed from legal cases or personal confessions), letters to the editor, photo captions, unless the subject matter lent itself to obvious informality by the use of humor and familiar address. The only articles which qualified as informal were certain (not all) movie and personality columns, certain daily columns in (e.g., Julie Yap Daza's 'Medium Rare' Times Journal), and certain feature articles; the criteria for informality were: use of nicknames, series of sentences and phrases separated by three periods, contractions, and code-switching to establish familiarity and rapport. These

---

[2]For speech, we used the terms 'careful(reading)' and 'casual' style, following Labov (1966). For writing, however, we prefer to use the more traditional terms 'formal' and 'informal' style of writing, since 'careful' and 'casual' do not quite fit in describing the writing styles analyzed.

features will be discussed in detail in Section 4.

The structural features (lexical and syntactic) which will be treated in this section were found to cut across formal and informal writing. Hence, for purposes of tabulation, frequencies were combined.

3.3 Operational Criteria for Inclusion as a Distinctive Feature

Because writing is edited, the chances of random or accidental errors due to performance factors are minimized, except for obvious typographical errors, which were excluded. Hence, for the writing sample, we did not think it necessary to stipulate that a feature had to occur more than once to be considered. It was enough that it occurred once in an article to qualify for listing, unless it was an obvious typographical error.

However, to ensure that the feature was not merely idiolectal but common to several (and therefore dialectal), we included the feature only if it was used at least once in at least six articles. We assumed as a working principle that the articles, even if not by-lined, were written by different writers. The junior author called a member of the staff of the newspaper or magazine to inquire about non by-lined articles to ensure that the same author was not being counted more than once. In instances where no one from the staff or magazine could identify the author(s) of certain non-by-lined articles, it was assumed that all anonymous articles of the same category (front page news, community news, business news, shipping news, movie news, sports news) of one issue were written by the

same writer.

The following illustrates the manner of attributing authorship:

Times Journal
December 22, 1977

Front page news

item 1--Romualdo Medina
item 2--Vicente Tañedo
item 3--'authorless'
item 4--'authorless'
item 5--'authorless'
item 6--Rene Fernandez
item 7--'authorless'

Community news

item 8--PNA
item 9--Dionisio Revita
item 10--'authorless'

The 'authorless' news items 3, 4, 5, and 7, which belong to the same category (front page news), were considered one news item presumably written by the same author/writer while item 10, which belongs to another category (*community* news), was considered a different news category presumably written by another author/writer.

Frequency counts were made of features of grammar, using words in a running text as the corpus.

On the grammatical level, the arbitrary rule of thumb observed was to consider every feature which was used at least once in at least six articles diealectal (and therefore, distinctively Philippine). The

following illustrates the method of frequency counting employed in singling out the distinctive features of Written Philippine English:

If

Article A carries
- 'in this side' twice
- 'He gave to me the book' once

Article B carries
- 'in the campus' once
- 'They reported to him the incident' once

Article C carries
- 'to be assigned at the campus' once
- 'She wrote to the president four letters' once

Article D carries
- 'to be charged for rape' thrice
- 'We flashed to the kids the cards' once

Article E carries
- 'in Kagitingan Street' twice
- 'Alma gave to us the records' once

Article F carries
- 'lost interest about the case' once
- 'The laborers said to me many things' once

Article G carries
- 'in their TV show' once
- 'My friends brought to us so much food' once,

the features use of different prepositions (where the sample phrases above belong) and indirect object introduced by 'to' placed between verb and direct object (where the sample sentences above belong) will be considered distinctive, the criterion established for singling out a feature being its use among at least six different authors.

3.4. Categories

The categories of features are lexical (under which fall such subcategories as preference for specific words and collocations, unusual words and collocations arising from Philippine culture and usage, and unusual prepositional usage) and syntactic (under which fall such sub-categories as word order [object-adverb sequence], unusual use of articles,

unusual tense-aspect usage, noun pluralization usage, pronoun-referent/antecedent incongruence).

3.4.1. Lexical Features

3.4.1.1. Preference for Specific Words and Expressions

TABLE 2 Special Words and Collocations Features of Written Philippine English, their Frequency of Occurrence, and Number of Authors/Writers Using Them

Features	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Features
shall preference	35 x	13
could preference	22 x	19
such preference	20 x	13
wherein preference	7 x	7
preference for of to signal possession	54 x	40

Although will and shall may be used interchangeably in English, the former is more common in American English while the latter occurs more frequently in British English and, curiously, in Philippine English:

> . . .you shall not be alone. . .Always my love thoughts, my prayers, my love shall be with you. . .

> The occasion shall be graced by the first visit of the Miraculous Image of the Virgin of Fatima to the Chapel.

> It's to be noted that the benefits of PD 968 shall not be extended to those sentenced to serve a maximum imprisonment of more than six years.

Significantly, the preference for the model shall is most discernible in sentences with a legalistic or obligatory

intent as shown by the preceding third sample sentence and these other two sentences:

> The Assembly shall have a secretariat and a president to be chosen from the delegates of the host country, and the chief delegates of other national parliaments shall sit as vice presidents.
>
> Funding will come from the ASEAN member countries and the venue of the Assembly shall be by rotation in the alphabetical order and shall meet once a year. . .

Where can would be preferred by GAE speakers or writers in certain contexts, could is more frequently used in Filipinos' speech or writing as shown by some of the sentences written by 19 of the authors/writers studied:

> I sure am interested to know how I could free myself from these attacks.
>
> Badoy cries out vengeance, but eventually not even his elegant moustache could stop him from falling in love with the wily Agueda.
>
> . . .if we start now on [sic] a positive program, we could prolong our lives.

The preference for and, using General American English as a standard, inaccurate use of such in certain expressions is also a distinctive feature of Written Philippine English. The use of the word may be illustrated by the following examples (where the definite the or this, that, these, or those is more appropriate to refer to something previously talked about):

However, such privilege [that privilege] is not a license to corrupt the minds of the people.

Before Decree 120, such dependents' pension [the dependents' pension] is [sic] paid only upon the death of the disabled member.

. . .there is an instruction of the DOH for hospitals to buy the drugs themselves if such drugs [these drugs] are not available. . .

The omission of the indefinite article a/an in expressions such as the following is likewise unusual:

People always have mind to do something but it takes one to ignite such idea [such an idea] into community action.

He said that such role [such a role] becomes more critical now. . .

Considering time, effort, and daily martyrdom that has become a way of life for the teacher, such increase [such an increase] might help him regain the enviable prestige and self-respect of his pre-war colleagues.

Another unusual usage involves clauses beginning with wherein, a word preferred by seven of the authors/writers instead of the more usual relativizers (note that his preference is likewise found in Spoken Philippine English):

Cesar E. A. Virata will deliver the keynote address wherein [in which] he is expected to discuss the new fiscal policies. . .

The other concession to the banks. . .is the removal of the matching requirements wherein [by which] financial intermediaries. . .are

> required to rele nd only up to the amount of deposit. . . .
>
> . . .still there are also strong points to our system, wherein [where] the offspring, irrespective of age . . .still stays at home. . . .

Another feature which occurs frequently is the preference for 'of' to express possession by persons. While American authors/writers generally prefer '(s)/my/your/his/her/our/their to show possession by persons ('all the president's men', 'the senators' complaint', 'nobody's business', 'his friend', 'my relatives'), Filipino authors/writers show preference for of to express the same idea. Notice the following examples of this feature:

> . . .he was appointed as a member of the Cabinet of General Emilio Aguinaldo. . . .
>
> . . .they are the responsibility of Brig. Gen. Prospero Olivas. . . .
>
> The much-publiczed move of Nora Aunor to go back to Christopher de Leon. . . .
>
> Basil is looking forward to that concert of his. . .

There appears to be no other reason for this than native language influence; possession expressions in most Philippine languages, whether the possessor is human or non-human, appear closer to the English of form ('ang mga tauhan ng pangulo', 'ang reklamo ng mga senadores', 'hindi gawain ng kanino man', 'kaibigan niya' [literally, 'friend of his'], 'mga kamag-anak ko' [literally, 'relatives of mine']) than to the '(s)/my/your/his/her/our/their form.

3.4.1.2. Unusual Words and Collocations

Sixty-four (64) instances among forty-eight (48) different authors were found of unusual words or collocations in Philippine usage.

We use the term 'collocation' in its simplest meaning, a combination of words, which could be a compound or a phrase.

The more unusual examples in the data are:

What are the safeguards <u>with regards to</u> [with regard to] the holding of the referendum?

Anybody who happens <u>to take hold</u> [to get hold of] or holds such counterfeit notes. . .should call a law enforcement officer.

In 1967, Rosalyn <u>delivered</u> [gave birth to] our second baby. . .

Luisito, prodded by his father, had to study for two years to <u>finish</u> [complete] his master's degree in business administration.

Even when she <u>transferred to</u> [moved to] Manila to study to be a teacher, she suffered no inconvenience at all. . .

Just the thing to have on hand to <u>sooth</u> [soothe] discomfort. [3]

The plan will <u>push</u> [go] through.

It was <u>agreed upon</u> [agreed] that the members will contribute to the fund.

---

[3] Apparently, the writer fails to pronounce the final interdental fricative as voiced. Another example is the verb in PE <u>breath</u> [briyθ] for GAE <u>breathe</u>.

With regards [regard] to the problem. . .

. . .aside from minimizing charity for those unfortunates [the unfortunate or those unfortunate people] . . .

Snazzy, no? [isn't it?]

Bel-Air is not too far, and I shall only get a cab. . .[4] [I can take a cab]

It did not also qualify. . . [It did not qualify either]

The different aggrupations [groups]. . .

What is it, Doctora [Doctor]?

The venue [site, place] of the seminar will be announced later.

The opposition's job is to fiscalize [call attention to the abuses of] the administration.

He has already smoked two sticks of cigarettes [two cigarettes].

She understood the problem, and so with the Commissioner [and so did the Commissioner].

He takes lunch [eats, has lunch] with his friends.

They get their ride [take a bus, jeepney] a few minutes after 5 P.M.

He is always available [free] in the evening.

The students wanted to be clarified [enlightened] on the subject.

---

[4]This is an attempt to translate Pilipino lang or lamang, loosely translated as 'only'. GAE: 'Bel-Air is not too far; I can take a cab'. Pilipino: 'Hindi naman malayo ang Bel-Air; magtatakxi na lang ako', lit. 'Bel-Air is really not far; I shall take a taxi only'.

How many pieces of this shirt [How many shirts of this type] did you order?

He looks like a living dead [He looks like Living Death].

The damage [contribution] for the party was ₱10.

Take your seat, please [Please be seated, Please sit down].

She is a faculty [a faculty member] of the school.

This group of summerians [summer students, summer graduates] has decided to explore a number of business possibilities.

"Hold your [the] line, " she was quick to say.

Everybody was taken cared [care] of by the hostess.[5]

The opposition seems to have an axe to grind against the KBL candidates [to be hostile to].[6]

The best way to understand the character of MacArthur, such as depicted [such as that depicted] in this movie, however, would be to take into consideration his military training.

Selling ideas can be fascinating even [even if] it is not for money.

Jones has shown he is at par if not better with [at par with, if not better than] any of the 16 imports in the field.

---

[5]A case of hypercorrection: double past participle.

[6]The idiom is correct in form but is not usually used in this context and without the final prepositional phrase beginning with against. A better idiom to use would be 'The opposition seems to have a bone to pick with the KBL candidates'.

But hopefully too, our agencies in the future would take extra effort to avoid unnecessary hardship for or even antagonism to the public [to avoid causing unnecessary hardship or even antagonism among the public].

3.4.1.3. Prepositional Usage

In instances where certain prepositions combine with certain verbs or adjectives to form verbal or adjectival phrases, Filipino authors/writers often omit the prepositions. Observe the following examples of the omission of prepositions from two-word verbs or verbal phrases:

Watchers will be able to see whether ballots are being erased, or substituted [substituted for] during the count.

. . .one can check whether or not the report. . . has been tampered [tampered with] along the way. . . .

However, their faces showed they were not exactly aware [aware of] how the sports center will affect their lives.

Filipinos are often discriminated [discriminated against] by American employers.

Another instance of preposition omission is in locative phrases:

She is now [in] first year of college.

Other instances of prepositional combinations that are unusual would be the addition of a preposition where it is not needed in GAE:

It was agreed upon [agreed] that the members will contribute to the fund.

Other isolated cases of prepositional overuse are:

PE	GAE
to request for	to request
to order for	to order
to mention about	to mention
to discuss about	to discuss
to demand for	to demand
despite of his pleas	despite his pleas (confused with 'in spite of his pleas')

One of the most frequent occurrences in Written Philippine English is the local use of different prepositions, a feature which appears 115 times in 73 different articles. Observe the following examples of the feature found in the articles studied:

PE Forms	GAE Forms
dealing on crime	dealing with crime
He sets his mind to any plan.	He sets his mind on any plan.
It also deprives the heart with oxygen supply.	It also deprives the heart of oxygen supply.
It results to heart attack.	It results in a heart attack.
in the campus	on the campus
in the Kowloon side	on the Kowloon side

PE Forms	GAE Forms
in the secondary level	on/at the secondary level
in her (bowling) team	on her (bowling) team
in the farm	on the farm
in their TV show	on their TV show
available in the local market	available on the local market
in the basketball court	on the basketball court
in the Chairman's board	on the Chairman's board
in some occasions	on some occasions
in the morning of December 3, 1977	on the morning of December 3, 1977
in/at Kagitingan (street)	on Kagitingan (street)
in/at the ground floor	on the ground floor
in a corner	on/at a corner
in the island	on the island
on its 46th year	in its 46th year
guilty for violations of office regulations	guilty of violations of office regulations
lost interest with the court case	lost interest in the court case
to be attached at the upper portion	to be attached to the upper portion
participants to the seminar	participants in/of the seminar
apply fertilizer on rice fields	apply fertilizer to rice fields
attributed his wife's recovered health on her "will to live"	attributed his wife's recovered health to her "will to live"

PE Forms	GAE Forms
cope up with the problems	cope with the problems
go up the stage	go up to the stage
superior than the previous plan	superior to the previous plan
in accordance to the regulation	in accordance with the regulation
give emphasis on something	give emphasis to something
discriminated upon	discriminated against
deal in/about	deal with

The use of English prepositions has always posed difficulty to Filipinos. Although they do not encounter difficulties with the use of prepositions where the meanings are clear ('in the room', 'on the wall', 'under the table', etc.), Filipinos find it difficult to master

two-word verbs (verbal phrases such as make up, make out, and try on) amd specific prepositions co-occurring with nouns (his interest in), adjective (happy for), and verbs (atrribute to). Curiously enough, with nouns associated with spatial ideas, Filipinos tend to use in instead of idiomatic on as shown in the preceding examples (in [on] the farm, in [on] the market, in [on] the Kowloon side). As long as English prepositions are not predictable from their ordinary meanings, the distinctively Philippine use of prepositions will always be discernible in the speech and writing of many Filipinos.

3.4.1.4. Minor Lexical Features

The rest of the features (those used by less than six authors/writers) under preference for specific words and collocations may be considered minor, but they may eventually become distinctive features of Philippine English in the future. Included in the list of words and collocations are the following:

(1) preference for up to (where until is more appropriate, its object being a time word or expression)

The exhibit will be open to the public starting December 22 up to February 3, 1978.

(2) preference for the same (where a pronoun would be more natural)

The priorities and policies set in the plan must also be thoroughly reviewed to see whether the same [they] need recasting. . .

(3) preference for the said (where it will not make any difference if it is omitted)

He returned the said award to the people who gave it to him.

(4) preference for he/him/his or she/her/her (where he/him/his alone can stand for both the male and the female species)

. . .a star is contracted or paid on a per-day basis, and. . .his or her scenes are at most only the ones to be shot.

(5) preference for to be able to + infinitive (where the shorter form can/could would be preferred by Americans)

The partnership. . .that has the 'stronger' hand usually wins the bidding, and having won the bid are [sic] usually able to make the 'contract' in the subsequent playing.

(6) preference for piece (where painting, oration, declamation, song, project, etc. would be more precise)

. . .he started working on his prize-winning piece [painting] on the 17th of December. . . .

(7) preference for others to stand for non-human referents

In the afternoon, PALARO '77' will be staged at the quadrangle participated in by Makati's public school and out-of-school youths in games like 'palo sebo', 'sack race', 'buko chasing', and others [other games].

(8) preference for get (where 'take' would be more usual)

. . .Bel-Air is not too far, and I shall only get [take] a cab. . . .

(9) preference for *also* in additional negation (where *either* or *neither* would be expected)

It did not also qualify. . .[It did not qualify either]

3.4.2. Syntactic Features

3.4.2.1. Word Order (Object-Adverb Sequence)

TABLE 3 Object/Adverb Positioning Features of Written Philippine English, their Frequency of Occurrence, and Number of Authors/Writers Using the Features

Features	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Features
time adverb placed before place adverb	47 x	35
adverb placed between verb and object	40 x	24
unusual adverb positioning	17 x	17
adverb placed between noun and *of* prepositional phrase	9 x	7
indirect object introduced by *to* placed between verb and direct object	7 x	7

Where GAE customarily follows the place adverb-before-time adverb order, Filipinos may put the time adverb before place adverbs. Observe the following instances of the *time adverb placed before place adverb* found in the data:

The first one was staged last year at the SMC auditorium in Makati.

. . .planners of the FLP met late November at the NDCP. . .

. . .the president arrived at 5:20 p.m. at the Quirino grandstand with the First Lady.

The biggest yearly undertaking of Mga Lingkod Bayan and the diplomatic ladies is 'International Bazaar '77' to be held on November 19, 1977 at the Folk Arts Theater.

Although there is no hard-and-fast rule with regard to the placement of adverbs in a sentence, seldom do American authors or writers place them between verbs and their objects. Generally, when adverbs occur in sentences with the subject-verb-object pattern, they either precede the verb or follow the object: 'They often speak English' or 'They speak English often'. Among Filipino authors/writers, however, placing adverbs between verbs and their objects appears to be emerging as a distinctive feature. Thus, in many of the articles studied, sentences such the following, where the adverb is placed between the verb and its object, occur:

I enjoyed very much your Fortune Forecast pull-out.

. . .softball enthusiasts cheered lustily the Philippine Blu Girls. . . .

Suffice it to say that in the country today, we have now Borzois.

A feature which is related to the time adverb placed before place adverb and adverb placed between verb and object features is unusual adverb positioning. Examples of this feature are the following:

The banks also will have [will also have] to assume only 30 percent of the loan risk.

. . .those who have been once on probation [who have once been on probation/who have been on probation once]. . . .

. . .because the bureau is increasingly being called upon [is being increasingly called upon] to raise more revenues. . .

. . .blood could not immediately be transfused [could not be immediately transfused] to him.

. . .there are a lot of raw materials and machineries which are only available in these countries [which are available only in these countries].

Not common to American authors/writers is the placement of certain adverbs between nouns and following of prepositional phrases:

He had been the classmate at the Ateneo of my older brother. ...[the classmate of my older brother at the Ateneo]

Edu issued the directive. . .after the breaking last week of the syndicate [after the breaking of the syndicate last week].

. . .during the three-day visit in Manila of a six-man EEC mission led by its Vice-President [during the three-day visit of a six-man EEC mission led by its vice-president in Manila].

Uncommon also among American authors/writers is the placement of the indirect object introduced by to between the verb and its object:

The Duluth did not report to the Coast Guard the volume of oil [did not report the volume of oil to the Coast Guard]. . . .

. . .the Philippines wants to export annually to the EEC 12,039 million T-shirts [to export 12,039 million T-shirts annually to the EEC].

The. . .(PNOC-EDC) has reported to Geronimo Z. Velasco the feasibility to converting the plants [has reported the feasibility of converting the plants to Geronimo Z. Velasco]. . . .

Relevant to word-order but difficult to categorize is the following example:

But the North American Conference of Separated and Divorced Catholics meeting for the fifth time early this year saw divorce as not a personal failure [not as a personal failure] but as a civil and spiritual coming to terms with the death of a relationship.

3.4.2.2. Use of Articles

TABLE 4 Use of Articles in Written Philippine English, Frequency of Occurrence, Number of Authors/Writers Using the Features

Features	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Features
absence of definite article	70 x	40
unusual use of definite article	15 x	10
absence of indefinite article	46 x	37

The absence of the definite article feature occurs in sentences such as the following:

> The reason for this is that government [the government] would like PITC to stand on its own.
>
> By industry, private sector's [the private sector's] outstanding credits are manufacturing. . . .
>
> He also urged the public to fully cooperate with the authorities. . .in order to avoid accidental outbreak [the accidental outbreak] of fire and injury. . . .

As far as the researchers are concerned, this feature is unusual since Philippine languages always require the use of an expression (ang [mga], si), which roughly corresponds to the English the, before nouns, common or proper ('Dumating na ang tubero', 'Nakakuha ng malaking bonus ang mga beterano', Tulog na si Myrna').

In fact, this feature of Philippine languages may be responsible for the occurrence of another feature of Philippine English, the unusual use of the definite article (where the definite article is used in PE but not in GAE):

> The project will also result in foreign exchange savings. . .and in the employment benefits for about 1,000 familes [and in employment benefits of about 1,000 families]. . .
>
> The fantastic response that Jack Jones received proved that the Filipinos still go for the ballads [that Filipinos still go for ballads] in spite of the advent of rock and jazz.

One of the TK's latest projects [One of TK's latest projects] is to establish a community theater.

Likewise, instances of the absence of the indefinite article occur among 37 authors. This feature may be observed in the following sentences:

. . .in spite of the economy's good performance in June 1973, there was marked slowdown [a marked slowdown] in "public employment".

In the islands up north, catching octopus is pastime [a pastime] for the women.

. . .a group of Belgian financiers has also submitted similar proposal [a similar proposal].

Given the difficulty of setting down the operative rules for the use of the article in English, the local usages are understandable; the difficulty for a second-language learner to master the rules is well-known. Undoubtedly, article usage will be one area where local usages will be most evident.

3.4.2.3. Noun Sub-Categorization

TABLE 5 Unusual Noun Sub-Categorization in Written Philippine English, Frequency of Occurrence, Number of Authors/Writers Using the Features

Features	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Features
Non-pluralization of count nouns	20 x	13
Use of one before a mass noun	19 x	11
Mass Noun Pluralization	73 x	41
Pluralization of adjectival nouns	14 x	9

The non-pluralization of count nouns is shown by sentences such as the following:

> The PTA will also hold dialogue [dialogues] with the farmers and the private sector.
>
> In addition, the project requires another ₱7,000,000 to be funded through fresh equity contribution [contributions].
>
> But the court ruled that economic benefit [benefits] to the employer can be used to justify a wage differential. . . .

Presumably, this feature happens because of the writer's failure to say the final [s] or [z] internally (recall the frequent omission of -s in such expressions as congratulations, instructions, public relations, United Nations, and United States by Filipinos, even educated ones). The reclassification arises from a phonological difficulty, it would seem.

On the other hand, Filipino writers seem to reclassify certain GAE mass nouns as count nouns. The evidence for the classification is manifested in two ways, the use of the indefinite article a/an or the counter one with a mass noun and the pluralization of mass nouns. Examples of the a/an or one with a mass noun are the following:

> . . .here is a wood sculpture [(a piece of) wood sculpture] by Abueva.
>
> I think serializing a fiction [(a piece of) fiction/ a short story/a novel] for five installments is quite long.

Therefore, he said, one good soap [one brand/kind of good soap] is just as good as another.

A convincing reason for the occurrence of one or a non-definite article before mass nouns is that certain mass nouns are not easily distinguishable as such and are therefore treated like count nouns. On the other hand, compare the underlined words in the foregoing sample sentences with other mass nouns such as fun, luck, rice, sugar, and water, which are seldom accompanied by a/an or the word one in the speech or writing of any Filipino with adequate English competence; clearly these are mass nouns in PE as they are in GAE.

Examples of mass nouns which were pluralized are advice (counsel), attention, bedding, bread, credit (reputation for financial solvency or integrity), deficit, evidence, fertilizer, furniture, lettering, lingerie, machinery, material (substance out of which something is or can be constructed), meat, offspring, property, soap, soup, and talk (conversation or gossip), which often surface as advices (there is such a form as advices but it is used to mean dispatches or official information), attentions, beddings, bickerings, breads, credits (when plural, credit means units earned for completing a course of study), deficits, evidences, fertilizers, furnitures, letterings, machineries, materials (when plural, material means another thing: tools or apparatus for the performance of a given task), meats, offsprings, properties (the plural form means qualities or attributes), soaps, soups, and talks (when plural, talk means short speeches).

Another over-use (by GAE standards) of pluralization is the use of plural forms in compound nouns:

> According to Bethooven[sic] Rualo, chief of the direct taxes division [direct tax division], the bureau's collections exceeded its goal of about ₱200 million for the year by almost ₱100 million.
>
> On the other hand, consumers groups [consumer groups] complain that the charges imposed by these finance firms are downright exorbitant. . . .

3.4.2.4. Pronoun-Antecedent Incongruence

TABLE 6 Pronoun-Antecedent Incongruence in Written Philippine English, Frequency of Occurrence, Number of Authors/Writers Using the Feature

Feature	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Feature
Pronoun-Antecedent Incongruence	37 x	26

This feature is characterized by the non-agreement between a pronoun (subject, possessive, or relative) and its antecedent in number, gender, or humanness (a term used by the researchers to distinguish

between [pro]nouns referring to human beings and those referring to non-human beings). Notice some examples of this feature:

> Even the export of ethyl alcohol has grown at a very rapid rate to double their [its] 1975 levels.
>
> Emmie wondered why her husband had to go through all that when after all, their [his] family owned the company. . . .
>
> He'll surely help many of your readers, only one of which [whom] is me.
>
> The furniture group is optimistic it could sell no less than $120,000 worth of their [its] products.
>
> When I was a beginner in advertising, our [my] boss happened to be handling two different brands of commercial cosmetic soap.
>
> I personally witnessed the proceedings, yes, and took part in it [them].

The use of plural pronouns in the first and fourth sample sentences above is probably attributed to the idea that export and group are plural (Don't we think/speak in terms of large quantities in exports? Isn't a group made up of a number of persons?); thus, the pronouns used to refer to them are plural ('their 1975 levels', 'their products'). On the other hand, the idea conveyed by the word proceedings, notwithstanding its plural form, could be singular (Isn't there only one event referred to by proceedings?), so perhaps this explains why the it pronoun is used to refer to proceedings. The

second and fifth sample sentences are decidedly influenced by the native language (where families, companies, provinces, schools, etc. are talked about in terms of their(s) and our(s), seldom his, her(s), or my/mine: 'Noong mamatay pa ako, malaki ang bahay namin', 'Hindi siya umuwi sa kanilang probinsiya'). The third sample sentence may be the result of a failure to discriminate between a human (pro)noun--who(m)--and a non-human (pro)noun--which, the reason, of course, being that relativization in the Philippine languages is quite different from that in English and that the [± human] distinction is not made in Philippine relative constructions.

3.4.2.5. Subject-Predicate Incongruence

TABLE 7 Subject-Predicate Incongruence in Written Philippine English, Frequency of Occurrence, Number of Authors/Writers Using the Feature

Feature	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Feature
Subject-Predicate Incongruence	52 x	37

Subject-Predicate incongruence may appear in sentences where the subject is singular:

> Only a three-inch line separated the Eagles and the Lions, but their current concern were worlds apart [their current concern was worlds apart].

99 per cent of those [sic] movie colony talk were pure hogwash.

. . .the same number of voters were accommodated.

Mainly responsible for the acceleration were the ₱14.8 million or 3.2 percent climb in eligible foreign balances. . . .

or in sentences where the subject is plural:

. . .the system's combined assets was held by ten savings banks.

Sharp lines of 1935 Rolls Royce owned by Renato Torres contrasts with rounded contours. . . .

The octopi stranded by a receding sea seeks shelter among the crevices.

. . .the containerized shipments has been made through MV Sipalay. . . .

The most plausible reason for the singular subject-marked predicate incongruence may be that a word or expression associated with the idea of plurality causes the deviation (e.g., worlds in '. . .but their current concern were worlds ', '99 in '99 per cent of of those movie colony talk were pure hogwash', and voters in '. . .the same number of voters were accommodated'), but the plural subject-unmarked predicate deviation is harder to explain since it frequently occurs in sentences where the plurality of the subject is too obvious to ignore (e.g., assets, lines, and shipments in the preceding sample sentences). In this regard, the incongruence may be due to the influence of the first language, since the form of the verb does not change

regardless of person in the Philippine languages. There is no obligatory distinction in form between the singular verb and the plural verb. The tendency of Filipino speakers seems to be to ignore the number distinction in the verb forms. The difficulty posed by the pronunciation of clusters with the final [s] or [z] may also be responsible for the subject-predicate incongruence characteristic of the writing of Filipinos.

3.4.2.6. Verb Sub-Categorization

TABLE 8 Verb Sub-Categorization in Written Philippine English, Frequency of Occurrence, Number of Authors/Writers Using the Feature

Feature	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Feature
Reclassification of GAE transitive verbs as intransitive verbs	13 x	8

Transitive verbs in GAE which have an obligatory object were used as intransitive verbs without direct objects:

> For this alone, the government has decided <u>to avail of</u> [to avail itself of] some ₱ 3 billion in domestic borrowings. . . .
>
> He will <u>avail</u> of [avail himself of] the benefits.

Excuse, excuse [Excuse me,/us].

At center is newsman Ed. D. Maloy, who covered [covered the event] for the "Daily Express".

3.4.2.7. Tense-Aspect Usage

TABLE 9 Tense-Aspect Usage Features, Frequency of Occurrence, Number of Authors/Writers Using The Features

Features	Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Authors/ Writers Using the Features
unusual use of verb forms/ tenses	11 x	9
unusual use of (past) perfect tense	45 x	36
lack of tense sequence	139 x	55

Filipino authors/writers use different verb forms or tenses in certain contexts. Observe the following examples of this feature:

Torrential rains. . .fell [have fallen] in Negros Occidental for the past two days. . .

But hopefully too, our agencies. . .would [will] take extra effort to avoid unnecessary hardship for or even antagonism to the public.

Unusual use of the (past) perfect tense is another distinctive feature of Written Philippine English, a

feature observable in such sentences as the following: [7]

> . . .we can say that we <u>had sort of reacted</u> [sort of reacted] too quickly.
>
> It <u>had been</u> [has been] well said that any flank action without having control of or stabilized the conter will not succeed.
>
> I remember a friend back in the province, who <u>had made</u> [made] it almost a habit to toast the coming of evening.
>
> It was reliably gathered two years ago, the Philippine Government <u>had bought</u> [bought] a big edifice in Madrid, Spain. . . .

Among the four examples cited above, the more frequent occurrence (3 out of 4 examples) is the use of the past perfect tense where GAE would use the simple past tense (a case of hypercorrection?).

Significantly, the feature which occurs most frequently is the lack of tense sequence. As observed by one English teacher, Filipino speakers or writers of English cannot seem to understand why they should say 'She <u>said</u> she <u>was moving out</u> of the country' when the movement is yet to happen or why it is more accurate to say 'He <u>told</u> me he was German' when he is still German.

---

[7]The unusual use of the present perfect tense does not appear in the written data, but the researchers have heard a number of Filipino speakers say sentences like 'I <u>have seen</u> [saw] the movie a long time ago' and 'Who <u>has come</u> [came] yesterday to see me?' Presumably, this feature occurs more frequently in speech than in writing.

Thus, from the articles studied, constructions such as the following occurred:

> Perez said safeguards have been instituted [had been instituted]. . . .
>
> Magsaysay said a "yes" vote will usher in [would usher in] elections. . . .
>
> Legal authorities wondered if this can be superseded [could be superseded] by a mere "memo of agreement". . . .
>
> . . .the huge amount would be saved if 10,000 offenders are [were] on probation annually.
>
> Would it be all right if we just have [had] the interview on the phone. . .?

3.4.2.8. Minor Syntactic Features

Minor syntactic features which have possibilities of becoming distinctive in Philippine English are the following:

(1) pluralization of adjectival noun phrase

> . . .aside from minimizing charity for those unfortunates [the unfortunate, those unfortunate people]. . . .

(2) non-attachment of the final -d or -ed to a past or past participle verb form

> . . .has rejuvenated the place at a time when other institutions were being phase [phased out].

(3) article-noun incongruence

. . .99 percent of those [that] movie colony talk were [sic] pure hogwash.

(4) absence of apostrophe after plural possessive or adjectival nouns

To grant to private hospitals with financial loans with government lending institutions a grace period of seven years moratorium [seven years' moratorium] in the payment of amortizations.

(5) use of singular nouns after one of

One of the reason [reasons] advanced by the oppositionists. . . .

(6) use of indefinite article before a plural noun

You want a male offspring [You want male offspring]?

This last minor feature may be a case of hypercorrection, the idea intended being singular; the noun is singular in form (without -s) but plural in co-occurrence restrictions.

(7) infinitive preference after certain phrasal verbs and adjective-preposition combinations

He is interested to write [interested in writing] movie scripts.

(8) subject-verb order in embedded who-clauses

There's no way of knowing who are these people [who these people are].

(9) preference for the passive construction

The games will be participated in by public school and out-of-school youth.

3.5. Summary

This chapter has set down the distinctive features of Written Philippine English in the mass media on the basis of lexical and syntactic features.

Under lexical features maybe mentioned the following:

preference for specific words and collocations, specifically shall, could, such, wherein, of (to signal possession)

Unusual words and collocations, specific terms and word combinations which may have been originally confused with other collocations but which because of frequent use have become fixed combinations in their own right

unusual prepositional usage, including omission of prepositions in two-word verbs, addition of prepositions to verb phrases, local use of different prepositions in noun phrases following certain verbs or adjectives

Under syntactic features may be mentioned the following:

word-order features, consisting of the placement of the time adverb before the place adverb, placement of the adverb between verb and object, placement of adverb between noun and preposition phrase, placement of the indirect object introduced by to between verb and direct object, other unusual adverb placements

use of articles, including absence of the definite article, unusual use of the definite article, and absence of the indefinite article

noun sub-categorization, consisting of the non-pluralization of count nouns, the reclassification of GAE mass nouns as count nouns, mass noun pluralization, pluralization of adjectival nouns in compounds

pronoun-antecedent incongruence

subject-predicate incongruence

reclassification of GAE transitive verbs as intransitive verbs

tense-aspect usage consisting of unusual use of verb forms and tenses, use of the perfect tense where the simple past or even present perfect tense is called for in GAE, lack of tense sequence .

4. Styles in Philippine English of the Mass Media

4.1. Frame of Reference

4.2. Hypothesis: The Limited Repertoire of Filipinos in English

4.3. Procedures for Analysis

4.4. The Data from the Philippine Mass Media

4.4.1. Spoken Philippine English

4.4.2. Written Philippine English

4.4.3. Mixing of Styles

4.4.4. The Similarities of Spoken and Written Philippine English

4.5. Summary

4.1. Frame of Reference

Joos (1969) lists five styles, depending on the solidarity between interlocutors (speaker and hearer): intimate, casual, consultative, formal, frozen.

For monolinguals, all five styles use the same code. However, for a bilingual or even a multilingual (which the Filipino is), different codes or combinations of codes may be used for each of these styles.

Data on code selection is provided by surveys and studies based on interviews and questionnaires on domains of English, Pilipino, and the Vernacular or Mother Tongue as well as such other communication variables as topic and interlocutor (See Sibayan and Otanes 1969, Pascasio 1972, Bautista et al. 1974, Castillo and Galang 1973, Lombos-Esquillo 1978).

Intimate communications usually make use of the mother tongue or the vernacular; for the Tagalog-speaker it would be Pilipino. For casual conversation, it would be the mother tongue or vernacular (home), Pilipino (school and neighborhood), and code-switching between English and Pilipino (school and mass media). It is not until one goes into consultative,[1] formal, and frozen styles that more extensive use of English is involved. Formal style is used for public ceremonies

[1]For consultative purposes, Filipino bilinguals in the Metro Manila area use English and Pilipino, the choice of code dictated by the status relations between interlocutors (if the interlocutor is a superior, then English is used; if an equal, either English or Pilipino depending on the subject matter or topic). Topics of business, science, and technology are almost always discussed in English.

and frozen style in documents; consultative involves a semi-formal atmosphere or occasion in which one discusses business, science, technology.

In the future, Pilipino will expand its domains and develop styles beyond the intimate and the casual, as it moves into domains which call for consultative, formal and even frozen styles. The expanded use of Pilipino frozen style (e.g. legal documents and treaties) will take some time, however. On the other hand, we foresee increasing uses of Pilipino which will call for consultative and formal styles.

However, temporarily, language activity calling for consultative and formal styles is predominantly done in English. The evidence is clear that the stylistic varieties of English are rather restricted because of its restricted domain in Philippine life. One will not expect English therefore to have the same degree of variety as one would in a society where English is the first language; moreoever, one would not expect Filipino speakers to have the same repertoire of styles (or stylistic range) as one would native speakers.

4.2. Hypothesis: The Limited Stylistic Range or Repertoire of Filipinos in English

Since English is learned as a second language almost exclusively in school (and lately, for children, through such TV programs as Sesame Street and the Electric Company) and since the chief use of English in Philippine life is that of being a language of education, especially as the language of science, mathematics and technology (until lately, also the

language of the humanities and the social sciences), it is to be expected that the style that Filipinos are most competent in would be the formal style or what can be called Textbook English. Textbook English is reinforced during the Filipino's entire schooling; outside of the school, except in the office and in office related domains (cocktail parties, formal receptions), there are not many occasions for the Filipino to make use of other styles.

Our working hypothesis therefore is that even in the Mass Media, the predominance of Textbook English (based primarily on written models) will be evident; the range of styles (the repertoire) will be limited; there will be a tendency to be monostylistic, and there will be problems of mixing styles (common to any society where a widely-used language is not native).

4.3. Procedures for Analysis

The analysis for this chapter, while using a subset of the materials gathered (tapes and publications) in Chapters 2 and 3, constitutes a separate one.

For Spoken Philippine English, we made a distinction between newscasts (on radio and TV) and talk-shows (on T.V.).

The newscast is a carefully edited and read statement; in Joos' terminology, it would be mid-way between the consultative and formal style (and in Philippine newscasts, it would tend towards the latter more than the former).

The talk-show, while unrehearsed, nevertheless involves self-conscious participants. The style in a

talk-show would be mid-way between Joos' casual and consultative style; it would tend towards the more distant consultative rather than the proximate casual.

Because our spoken samples did not fit Joos' classification neatly, we decided to use Labov's (1966) distinction between careful (reading) style and casual style.

Six newscasts (three radio and three TV) involving twelve announcers and five TV talk-shows involving twenty-seven interlocutors were taped and analyzed for the study; these constituted a subset of the same tapes we used for Chapter 2.

The tapes consisted of recordings of the following:

DZAC 7:00 - 7:15 AM	October 4, 1977
DPI Radio 9:00 - 9:15 PM	October 5, 1977
DZXX 7:00 - 7:15 AM	October 7, 1977
Channel 9 7:00 - 7:30 PM	November 7, 1977
Channel 13 7:00 - 7:30 PM	November 30, 1977
Channel 9 8:30 - 9:00 AM	November 15, 1977

The samples were classified as examples of the careful (reading style).

The taped talk-shows were:

Dialogue Channel 13 5:00-6:00 PM November 9, 1977
Interaction Channel 7 12:00-1:00 PM November 6, 1977
Late Hour with June and Johnny Channel 7 10:30-11:30 PM November 11, 1977
Business with Pleasure Channel 4 9:30-10:30 PM November 19, 1977
TV Debate on Life Channel 4 7:30-8:30 PM November 30, 1977

The samples were classified as examples of the casual style.

We selected specific variables (discussed in the next section) as foci for observing substitutions of various kinds. Other than give indications of frequency of occurrence we were not able to test for significant differences, since there were more interlocutors than newscasters. Hence, the more frequent occurrence of certain variables among interlocutors would be predictable.

For Written Philippine English, we used news stories, feature articles (including short stories and short historical accounts), editorials, columns, letters to the editor (no matter where these articles appeared, front page, society page, business page, entertainment and sports pages) to obtain samples of formal written Philippine English (manifesting Joos' consultative and formal styles; one can even speak of a frozen style for the news stories). We used certain columns (e.g. Julie Yap Daza's 'Medium Rare'), entertainment columns, columns about movies and movie stars, personality columns (mostly about prominent people in society) to obtain samples of informal written English (Joos' casual and consultative styles) where some evidence of stylistic differentiation was indicated, after empirical testing of various classifications.

What emerged from the initial testing is that even in columns on the entertainment and society pages and even in light feature articles aimed towards amusing the reader, the style used is still for the most part consultative, even formal; in other words, the style used is still reminiscent of the classroom composition style used in school.

We tested style as a function of distance between writer and reader in the personality columns and again found that these columns were written in the classroom composition style, except for occasional conscious attempts at intimacy in the gossip columns of movies and entertainment sections, and more consistently, in Julie Yap Daza's 'Medium Rare'.

In the self-consciously casual, even intimate, style of the weeklies, social distance is bridged by code-switching from English to Pilipino rather than by manipulation of the code (English).

In the sports stories and columns, the distance between the writer and reader is still evident. While these use standard sports jargon, the sentence structure, lexical choices (except for the sports lexicon) as well as degree of distance were the same as those found in news stories and informative feature articles. At most, one can say that there is a special lexicon used for sports, business, shipping, and transportation, the classified ads--evidence of different registers being used but not different styles.

Eight publications (four newspapers and four magazines) were analyzed for this section of the study, again a subset of the larger set of publications analyzed for Chapter 3:

Bulletin Today	December 16, 1977
Times Journal	December 22, 1977
Evening Express	January 4, 1978
Sports World	January 6-13, 1978
Panorama	December 11, 1977

Focus	January 7, 1978
Expressweek	October 13, 1977
Mod	January 20, 1977

We decided to use traditional terminology and used informal (Joos' casual) and formal (Joos' consultative-formal) to label the two styles of writing we wished to consider and classified the articles as follows (excluding foreign-authored articles):

INFORMAL	FORMAL
entertainment columns	news stories
personality columns	feature articles (informative)
feature articles (amusing)	news columns
	columns in the editorial page
	sports stories and columns

As with Spoken Philippine English, we chose certain variables as foci for observation and will discuss these in a subsequent section. Again, the frequency counts will be merely indicative and were not tested for significance since the samples were not equalized.

4.4. The Data from the Philippine Mass Media

4.4.1. Spoken Philippine English

TABLE 1 Segmental Phoneme Variables, Number of Speakers Using the Variables, and Frequency of Occurrence of the Variables

Segmental Variables	Number of Speakers in the Careful (Reading) Style Using the Variables (Total of 12 interlocutors)		Frequency of Occurrence of the Variables	Number of Speakers in the Casual Style Using the Variables (Total of 27 interlocutors)		Frequency of Occurrence of the Variables
[æ]-[ɛ] substitution	6	3.3	20 x	17	5.7	97 x
[ɪ]-[ɪy] substitution	X		X	X		X
[ə] (reduced)-[I] substitution	10	5.3	53 x	18	3.5	63 x
[ə] (reduced)-[ey] substitution	8	2.6	21 x	17	2.1	35 x
[ɔ]-[o] substitution	2	3.5	7 x	5	2.2	11 x
[θ]-[t] substitution	1	1	1 x	6	1.8	11 x
[ð]-[d] substitution	8	2.3	18 x	19	3.5	67 x
[z]-[s] substitution	10	11.0	110 x	16	9.0	144 x
[ž]-[š] substitution	7	1.3	9 x	7	1.4	10 x
[f]-[p] substitution	1	1.0	1 x	2	1.0	2 x

Segmental Variables	Number of Speakers in the Careful (Reading) Style Using the Variables (Total of 12 Interlocutors)	Frequency of Occurrence of the Variables	Number of Speakers in the Casual Style Using the Variables (Total of 27 Interlocutors)	Frequency of Occurrence of the Variables
[v]-[b] substitution	3	7 x	3	3 x
	2.3		1.0	
[r] (retroflex)-[r] (trilled) substitution	3	10 x	7	28 x
	3.3		4.0	
Hesitation (ah) utterance	X	X	17	89 x
			5.2	

An attempt to make the frequencies comparable was made by dividing the frequency by the number of newscasters or interlocutors using the feature, to come out with an average frequency. This number is indicated below each pair.

Even without these averages, however, and merely looking at the raw scores, it will be seen that the only feature in the data really distinguishing careful (reading) style from casual style is the occurrence of hesitation phenomena (ah) in the samples for casual style, eighty-nine times (89) among seventeen (17) interlocutors, or an average occurrence of 5.2 times per interlocutors. Since hesitation phenomena of this sort cut across cultures, such behavior is probably universal, certainly

not distinctive for Philippine English (casual style).

Not indicated in this set of data but indicated in Chapter 2 is the occurrence of the tag question no? at the end of a sentence, with rising intonation; this seems to be a feature of casual style (spoken) and in the data in Chapter 2 occurred thirty-eight (38) times among five (5) speakers.

Among the variables observed, the following substitutions seem to occur more often for casual style:

[ə]-[ə] substitution
[θ]-[t] substitution
[ð]-[d] substitution
retroflex [r]-trilled [r] substitution

The trilling of [r] in the casual style occurs frequently in initial position ([rrural] for rural, [rrampant] for rampant) and in Spanish-derived names ([verr]for Ver, [marrkos] for Marcos, [gu'tye rres] for Gutierrez and [ə poll'narr] for Apolinar). In a few instances, however, the [r] trilling may occur in medial position ([forren] for foreign, [metrro] for Metro).

What is interesting is that in careful (reading) style, the spelling pronunciations seem to occur more often (on closer scrutiny, this is perfectly understandable since the spelling becomes the guide for pronunciation) so that there is a more frequent occurrence of the [z]-[s] substitution and occurrences of the unreduced vowels [ɪ], [ey], and [o] instead of [ə] in careful (reading) style.

What is not fully explainable is the more frequent occurrence of the [v]-[b] substitution in careful (reading) style than in casual style, since occurrences of [v] in English are clearly marked by spelling. It seems that certain newscasters have problems with [v].

For both newscasters and interlocutors, it seems that the sound [I] as in fit has been mastered, for no occurrence takes place of the [I]-[Iy] (feet for fit) substitution.

Not observed in the data (because not focused on as a variable) but needing further investigation is the [Iy]-[I] substitution, already pointed out in Chapter 2, where words such as meet, deed are pronounced as [mIt], [dId] instead of [mIyt] and [dIyd].

4.4.2. Written Philippine English

TABLE 2 Variables, Types of Journalistic Writing, Frequency of Occurrence of the Variables, Number of Articles (Authors) Using the Variables

Variables	Types of Journalistic Writing		Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Articles (Authors) Using the Variables
Loan Words	FORMAL	news stories	1 x	1
		feature articles (informative)	8 x	2
		columns	none	none
	INFORMAL	entertainment/ society columns	9 x	4
		feature articles (amusing)	41 x	10

Variables	Types of Journalistic Writing		Frequency of Occurrence	Number of Articles (Authors) Using the Variables
Nicknames	FORMAL	news stories	11 x	2
		feature articles (informative)	none	none
		columns	none	none
	INFORMAL	entertainment/ society columns	53 x	11
		feature articles (amusing)	27 x	6
Special Abbreviations	FORMAL	news stories	7 x	4
		feature articles (informative)	1 x	1
		columns	none	none
	INFORMAL	entertainment/ society columns	21 x	8
		feature articles (amusing)	10 x	4
Contractions	FORMAL	news stories	none	none
		feature article (informative)	30 x	9
		columns	9 x	5
	INFORMAL	entertainment/ society columns	47 x	10
		feature article (amusing)	67 x	19
Suspensive Three Periods	FORMAL	news stories	none	none
		feature article (informative)	none	none
		columns	none	none
	INFORMAL	entertainment/ society columns	16 x	6
		feature article (amusing)	15 x	6

The one feature which clearly differentiates formal from informal Written Philippine English is the use of the suspensive three periods, found most often in personality and entertainment columns: 'And this is what I get in return. . .'.

There is another use of three periods, for a series of short notices (full-length sentences) on various topics in the same paragaph, describable as 'news tidbits'. This use of three periods is found most often in entertainment and personality columns but is likewise found in news columns, for example, Teodoro Valencia's 'Over a Cup of Coffee', which is clearly not written in an informal style. Hence, we do not consider serial listing using three periods as a distinctive feature of informal writing.

News stories, apart from other types of formal and informal writing, do not make use of contractions as a convention in writing, although as Table 2 suggests, contractions are found more frequently in informal writing, although not exclusively so: 'There's one on how to relieve boredom'.

Again, loan words, nicknames, and special abbreviations (Co , a compadre of Cezar; Pons Valdez, Boysie Henares; Dec. 29, Bo. Busay) occur in all types of articles, formal and informal, although they occur more frequently in informal writing (entertainment/society page columns, amusing feature articles).

The one clear linguistic marker for informality is code-switching, as has already been mentioned earlier, but this type of phenomenon is outside the purview of this study.

4.4.4. The Similarities of Spoken and Written Philippine English

Another area that bears investigation would be to examine the similarities between Spoken and Written Philippine English.

Obviously, the edited newscast and the 'frozen' style of news writing would not be useful data bases for the kind of comparison we have in mind.

Much more useful would be the comparison between the speech of interlocutors in the talk-show and the informal writing of columns and features.

The structural features of Spoken Philippine English described in Chapter 2 are likewise found in Written Philippine English: the use of no? as an interrogativizer; the unusual uses of prepositions (including addition of prepositions to verbs); the use of the title Doctora; the special use of already; and the occurrence of unusual terms and collocations.

Moreover, listed as minor features in Spoken Philippine English are features likewise found in Written Philippine English: preference for could;

local meanings for common words; unusual use of wherein; unusual use of positively marked words where GAE would use a negatively marked word (also, yes); omission of prepositions from certain phrasal verbs; preference for of to express possession.

For syntactic features, in both Spoken and Written Philippine English, non-observance of subject-predicate agreement and different types of congruence (pronoun-antecedent) occur. Under minor features in Spoken Philippine English are found similar features (major) in Written Philippine English: word-order features, unusual uses of the article, non-plural nouns after 'one of', pluralization of adjectival nouns.

Needing further investigation would be other features (with appropriate non-linguistic and paralinguistic markers or the absence of them) which explain the impression given that Filipinos speak as they write, that somehow the distance between the spoken and written phase of the language is not great, with the latter predominating, since the Filipino does learn English from reading and writing more than from listening and speaking. Undoubtedly, this partially explains his monophasal 'Textbook English'.

4.3.3. Mixing of Styles

Not borne out by the written data (because of its careful editing) is the usual mixing of styles (usually, frozen or formal and consultative or casual)

which we noticed outside the data.

A certain amount of style-mixing may be gleaned from the use of nicknames in news stories; special abbreviations in news stories, informative feature articles; and contractions in informative feature articles and news columns or commentaries. As the data bear out, these features are more commonly found in informal writing.

It is very common for example for many Filipinos to speak of a conflagration (frozen) instead of a fire; to refer to a person as the alleged person (frozen) instead of the person earlier referred to. Or a person in polite society saying, 'I would like to go to the toilet' or worse still, 'I would like to move my bowels' or 'I would like to urinate'. Besides the social inappropriateness of making such statements in public (part of communicative competence), the frozen (in this case, medical) vocabulary is out of place in a classroom situation which is usually consultative or even casual and which would call for the use of a euphemism ('I'd like to go to the washroom').

However, this matter deserves separate investigation as the data do not lend themselves to this kind of analysis because of their edited character.

4.4. Summary

This chapter has at best been preliminary, an attempt to verify empirically the hypothesized mono-stylistic character of Philippine English because of its limited domains as well as process of acquisition (in school and through academic means).

The evidence is clear that at least in the mass media, careful and casual Spoken Philippine English do not differ significantly from each other, except in hesitation phenomena (ah), which are probably universal, and in segmental substitutions which more careful (edited and read) speech does not make, as well as in the manner of asking questions (no?).

In Written Philippine English, the differences in the style of various types of articles in newspapers and magazines are likewise minimal. Structural features which are distinctive for Philippine English are found in both styles. What differentiates one style from another are relatively minor features such as the more frequent use of loanwords, nicknames, contractions, and the distinctive use of suspensive three periods in informal writing. The problem is that this type of informal writing is found only in certain columns (society, entertainment, and amusing features done by a few stylistically versatile journalists).

Other columns (even society and entertainment) and feature articles meant to amuse and attempting to be casual are still written in the relatively formal style reminiscent of classroom themes. 121

While the following conclusion is tentative and needs further investigation, the present evidence would warrant the hypothesis that by and large Philippine English of the Mass Media at this stage of its evolution is monophasal (the same variety is used in both the speaking and the writing phase) and monostylistic (the stylistic range for casual and careful/informal and formal is narrow, with the latter variety predominating).

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary of Findings

5.2. Theoretical Issues

5.2.1. Corpus, Sampling and Frequency Counts

5.2.2. The Status of the Phonological System and Transcription

5.2.3. Errors and Features

5.2.4. Substrata, Idiolects, and Dialects

5.2.5. Random or Regular Occurrence

5.2.6. Code-Switching

5.2.7. Categorization of Features

5.3. Future Research

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary of Findings

By and large, the findings confirm earlier studies of Philippine English (Llamzon 1969, Dar 1973, Ponio 1974) and add to the list of features.

Philippine English has a smaller inventory of phonological units (vowels and consonants); vowel reduction (use of schwa) does not seem to be prevalent; the collapsing of phonological distinctions is most evident in vowels and fricatives; syllable structures consisting of complicated consonant clusters are simplified; shifting of stress is distinctive in certain words, especially words of more than three syllables; there seems to be a preference for sustained juncture at the end of clauses and phrases, and in the casual style at least, no with rising intonation is a common mode of yes-no questioning.

What is evident (and something hitherto not called to the attention of scholars) is the prevalence of spelling pronunciations, understandable in a society which learned English mostly through reading and written textbooks rather than hearing it from native speakers.

In Written Philippine English, the most distinctive feature seems to be a local set of rules for tenses and the lack of tense sequence (139 times in 55 articles), the local use of prepositions, and unusual lexical and collocational items, not merely loans from the Philippine languages nor words reflective of the culture carried into English but new terms, lexical combinations,

phrases (including loan translations that are distinctively Philippine and new semantic meanings for existing GAE lexical items).

Among educated Filipinos, we would not go sofar as to make the observation that Filipinos are linguistic infants in the use of English but would make the observation that because Filipinos have other languages in their repertoires, they do not need to depend solely on English for different styles. They reserve English for occasions calling for the consultative, formal, and *frozen* styles and hence are limited in their stylistic ranges. Moreover, Philippine English of the Mass Media at least for casual and formal styles seems to be similar in features, by and large, 'text-bookish', again due to the manner of acquisition of English in school. Spoken and Written Philippine English are monophasal--Filipinos speak as they write--and the differences between Spoken and Written English do not seem to be extensive. Written Philippine English follows a 'composition style' prevalent in Philippine class-room and Spoken Philippine English is close to 'text-book English'.

The value of the study, in our opinion, lies in its presentation of features, based on systematic data gathering and sampling as well as preliminary counting of specific corpora which indicate the features that will become standard in Philippine English in the

future. Hence, the directions of language change and adumbrations of the standardized variety in the future may be gleaned from the data. For historical purposes, in tracing language change, the diachronic evolution of a future Standard Philippine English is provided initial description.

5.2. Theoretical Issues

Any study of transplant languages and Third World Englishes will have to reckon with theoretical issues raised in the course of this study.

5.2.1. Corpus, Sampling and Frequency Counts

We have to go beyond impressionistic observations in recording the emerging features of a local variety of English and do the same type of systematic textual analysis done by Fries (1952) for American English and by Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) for Contemporary British and American English. Hitherto (Llamzon 1969, Dar 1973) no attempt at systematic corpus gathering and sampling has been done, although Llamzon pioneered in innovative elicitation techniques and recognition techniques to establish the psychological reality of this variety of English. Ponio (1974) used specific corpora but did not do frequency counting to differentiate between random occurrences and more systematic occurrences, between idiolect and a dialect in the process of becoming standardized.

The corpora used in this study are representative of only one domain (the domain of communications through the mass media, radio, TV and the press); in the future, corpora from other domains where English is used in the Philippines (classrooms where science, mathematics, and technology are taught; board rooms and upper-level management offices; hotels and tourist centers; certain nightclubs and places of entertainment) will have to be systematically culled and analyzed to obtain representative corpora from these other domains of English in Philippine life.

The frequency counts made in this study were primitive. Using running text for Written Philippine English and extensive tape recordings of Spoken Philippine English, future researchers will have to do better frequency counts, with enough samples to make sure that the features observed are not random (for each speaker) and that they are dialectal rather than idiolectal.

Within these corpora, systematic classification according to styles and registers will have to be made, and decisions made on the features to be observed; in turn, these features must be selected on the basis of preliminary observations and derived inductively.

5.2.2. The Status of the Phonological System and Transcription

In studying Spoken Philippine English, an initial and basic decision has to be made on which type of phonological representation to use. We purposely confined ourselves to be a broad phonetic transcription

and shied away from a phonemic or morphophonemic representation since we were not sure about the status of the phonology of English among Filipino bilinguals.

Does the Filipino bilingual have coexistent phonemic systems (Pike and Fries 1949) or a merged system? How are we to adequately describe and explain phonological representations based on orthography, which are psychologically real for the Filipino, as the data manifest so convincingly? Chan-Yap (1974) in her dissertation makes a case for Hokkien loanwords into Tagalog undergoing certain phonological processes consisting of a series of substitution rules to form underlying representations, which are then subjected to the usual phonological (including accentual) rules of Tagalog. Could a similar case be made for the phonological system of English and a similar processing hypothesized for English words, except that in this case, it would be a systems-wide conversion set of rules?

The fact that Filipino bilinguals devoice fricatives [z] and [ž] argues for the formulation of substitution rules based on features rather than isolated segments.

Difficult theoretical issues in phonology thus emerge from the study of languages in contact, likewise with profound implications for the study of pidginization and creolization.

5.2.3. Errors and Features

Prator (1968) speaks of the 'heresy' of the British approach to English-language teaching; it seems that the

British have been much more tolerant of the local varieties of Third World Englishes emerging and perhaps more realistic in accepting the language acquisition limitations of human beings in a second-language situation.

In any case, whatever one's attitude towards the phenomena of Philippine English, the lack of native GAE models, the appropriation of American English by Filipinos as a second official language and as the language of the schools, of business, and of wider communication, is a fact. What is fact likewise is that inspite of the relatively extensive use of this transplant language, Filipinos do not speak English the way Americans do; even educated Filipinos who have lived in the United States, a definite minority, do not speak as Americans do.

The elites of any society set the standards for speech in any community. The educated elites and the disseminators of a variety of English used in the mass media use a variety of English which is emerging as having the features we have described, more or less on a stable basis.

From the point of view of a TESOL teacher, these features would be classified as errors of pronunciation, word usage, and grammar.

When do these errors cease to be errors and become part of the standard? If enough educated elites in the society 'commit' these errors, then these errors in effect have been accepted by the society as the standard.

The thin line separating error from accepted feature is difficult to trace, however. We have worked on the assumption in this study that if any sector of this society can influence the shift, it will be the speakers of the mass media who are assumed to set the standard and who have the opportunity to function as models, whether by design or not.

In effect, we are making a case for newscasters and TV hosts as well as interlocutors on talk-shows, for the most part recruited from the educated elites of Philippine society, as the pace-setters for Spoken English, and for daily writers of newspapers and periodicals as the pace-setters for Written English in this country.

One can accept local rules for the use of articles, verb tenses, reclassification of nouns and verbs. More difficult to accept would be pronoun-antecedent incongruence and subject-predicate disagreement as to person and number. Are these part of competence or simply occurrences of poor performance? After all, even first-language speakers of GAE make mistakes of agreement and concord especially in writing long sentences, although undoubtedly not as frequently as Filipinos do.

5.2.4. Substrata, Idiolects and Dialects

There are as many Philippine accents of English as there are Philippine vernaculars. A keen ear can detect the substratal first language of an average speaker of English. Based only on such speakers, one cannot speak of Philippine English but of an Ilocano-

accented English spoken by a Filipino of Ilocano ethnic extraction or a Hiligaynon-accented English spoken by a Filipino of Hiligaynon ethnic extraction.

Thus, even when the English language becomes a common language for Filipinos of varying ethnic origins, one cannot speak of a standard language but a conglomeration of idiolects.

The process of leveling and homogenization will take another generation, assuming the stability of bilingualism in the Philippines.

When do these idiolects become similar enough to constitute a dialect, in effect, a standardized variety of English spoken in the Philippines, similar enough in main features to be called Philippine English?

This question was posed by Gonzalez (1972) in his review of Llamzon's (1969) Standard Filipino English. There is overwhelming evidence of course that this process of standardization is taking place and that Filipinos and non-Filipinos alike can recognize such a local variety. The point at issue is not the emergence but whether or not a point of homogenization of the different accents arising from the substratal first languages has reached a point of stability. This is of course difficult to measure.

Once again, however, our contention in this study is that if this process of standardization is taking place, then the place to look for this emerging standard would be the mass media, since in Philippine society today,

the speakers of the mass media are in the best position to provide modeling for the entire nation. The only other serious candidates for providing models would be classroom teachers with their individual accents; but then, classroom teachers do not have the exposure that mass media people do.

5.2.5. Random or Regular Occurrence

In observing speakers whose language is being described, one must make a distinction between random errors and regular errors (or features which are part of the system). To use the Chomskyan distinction, we are trying to describe competence, not performance.

The problem, of course, is that variation is not that simple. The limited data on careful (reading) and casual style confirms Labov's (1966) model of systemic variation which cannot be described by means of categorical (yes-or-no) terms but by means of a frequency index or point on a probability cline.

In careful (reading) style, the Filipino does use certain features more frequently than in casual style. He is more careful to make sure that he uses [s] in such words as hat, rack, mat, as he has been taught in his pronunciation classes; in casual speech, he 'forgets himself' and switches more frequently to his more comfortable [s]. On the other hand, in his careful (reading) style, he more frequently uses spelling

pronunciations, influenced as he is by the written page before him: a book becomes [ey'buwk] and unstressed vowels are given their full vocalic quality instead of being reduced to [ə].

These occurrences are not random but regular, although governed by probability rather than categorical rules.

A model to describe stylistic range and choices would then have to incorporate probability indices into its rules.

As Philippine English expands its stylistic range and as Filipinos enlarge their stylistic repertoires, the features already described would increase to effect further differentiation.

5.2.6. Code-Switching

Code-switching does not occur in formal writing and in the careful (reading) style, which is edited. However, it does take place in informal writing and in casual conversation, although there was less of this in the talk-shows than in other types of talk-shows which are almost exclusively in Pilipino but which involve switching into English when discussing academic topics. We systematically avoided discussing code-switching since it was outside the scope of our research, although in describing the linguistic profiles of Filipino bilinguals, code-switching will definitely have to be included as part of the repertoire and as having specific functions especially for casual and intimate communication. In

the data, however, we systematically excluded instances of code-switching, although we noticed that had we gone more deeply into the casual and intimate styles, we would have had to include the code-switching variety in our description.

5.2.7. Categorization of Features

In analyzing various lexical and syntactic features, one of the most difficult problems encountered was a consistent way of categorizing these features.

We did not consider loanwords as particularly interesting and worthy of attention since in any kind of bilingual situation, such loans are expected and predictable.

We purposely avoided the term 'Filipinism' since we did not think that the term was specific enough to give us operative criteria for analysis. Llamzon (1969) popularized the term; Dar (1973) and Ponio (1974) used it to cover loanwords, terms referring to Philippine reality, collocations arising from Philippine usage (bakya crowd), loan translations ('Open the light' from buksan mo ang ilaw), and mixing of collocations from various sources ('It's up for you' from 'It's up to you' and 'It's for you') or prepositional usage arising from translations from Pilipino (Nahihiya na ako sa iyo 'I am ashamed to you already' , paraphrasable as 'Already I feel embarrassed about this [it involves you])' or mixing of two-word verbs ('I am going to sound off Juan about this' meaning 'I am

going to sound out Juan about this', a confusion of sound off with sound out). Hence, rather than use 'Filipinism' as a cover term for all these, we decided to avoid the term completely and use the labels we did use. Actually, we ourselves would confine the term 'Filipinism' only to specific terms and collocations arising from Philippine culture; thus, the only occurrences of Filipinism would be examples of collocations such as bakya crowd and the common tao (which refer to Philippine reality and follow the derivational rules of English) and for such neologisms found only in the Philippines as aggrupation for 'group' and distinctly Philippine significata for GAE words such as viands 'everything eaten during a meal besides rice, translation for ulam', venue 'site, in GAE confined only to the legal register'.

Under syntactic categories, an in-depth study will try to formulate local rules for the use of the present perfect tense and past perfect tense forms; in Philippine English, there seems to be an absence of the tense sequence rule (as found in GAE), frequent non-application of congruence rules (pronoun-antecedent, subject-predicate).

Local rules should likewise be formulated for the use of articles in Philippine English, obviously different in many lower-order rules from rules of General American English, especially for general statements.

We decided to categorize special uses of prepositions in noun phrases and in two-word verbs as lexical features rather than syntactic features, since these combinations seem to be learned as phrasal units.

Certain features clearly arise from phonological difficulties but have syntactic implications [s/z] for third person agreement, [t/d/ɪd] for the past and past participle forms, nonpluralization because of consonant clusters. Again, are these to be classified as phonological, lexical or syntactic features?

5.3. Future Research

TV talk-shows while unrehearsed are still un natural situations. Certainly the language sample from such exchanges and transactions would not be completely casual. We need more data for other occasions when spontaneous non-self-conscious speech can be stimulated or elicited to obtain better data for casual styles of Spoken Philippine English in domains which call for the use of this style of Philippine English: classrooms, business establisments of certain types, board meetings, cocktail parties at embassies and in business organizations. In other words, we need better samples of Spoken Philippine English outside of the mass media in other domains which call for the casual and the consultative styles. For Written Philippine English, we need a scholar such as Fries to study the informal communications (in English) of Filipinos: letters, interdepartment memos, notices, street signs, other unedited writing, including private communications, assuming this is ethically permissible.

We likewise need more systematic gathering of lexical and collocational peculiarities for the distinctive

features of Philippine English at the lexical level. We will most likely need to set up many subcategories for these. Then we shall have to set up a system of frequency counting using corpora from various domains to ensure that they are neither random nor idiolectal.

Finally, another area which needs intensive investigation is the interesting subject of stylistic impoverishment arising from the monostylistic characteristic of Philippine English and the lack of mastery among most Filipinos of more than one style of spoken or written Philippine English. It is part of communicative competence to add to one's stylistic repertoire and to know the sociolinguistically appropriate rules when to use such styles. Moreover, wherever one has a situation of a second language not perfectly mastered, one is bound to come upon mixing of styles, a phenomenon which undoubtedly occurs more often in conversation and impromptu speeches and in unedited writings (hence, the lack of samples in our data). Such mixing needs systematic investigation if only to help the Filipino enlarge his repertoire and enhance his communicative competence and linguistic versatility.

Finally, in studying styles, we should use lexical criteria (certain expressions and words belong to certain styles) to isolate these varieties. Our variables for studying careful/casual styles of Spoken Philippine English and formal/informal styles of Written Philippine English did not include enough lexical variables, especially content words clearly marked for a specific style. In some future research, more attention to lexical variables should be paid to lexical markers of stylistic varieties, in

addition to the ones we used, to find out if indeed at the lexical level, the Filipino bilingual has or does not have a range of styles.

REFERENCES

AQUINO, MILAGROS ROMAQUIN et al. The most intelligible variety of English pronunciation. PCLS Monograph Series No. 6. Quezon City: Alemar-Phoenix Publishing House, Inc.

BAILEY, RICHARD W. and JAY L. ROBINSON (eds.). 1973. Varieties of present-day English. New York: The MacMillan Company.

BAKER, SIDNEY J. 1966. The Australian language. Sidney: Curraway Publishing Company.

BANSAL, R.K. 1969. The intelligibility of Indian English. Monograph 4. Hyderabad: Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.

BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. 1974. The Filipino bilingual's competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching. Unpublished dissertation. Manila: Ateneo-de Manila University-Philippine Normal College Consortium.

_____ et al. 1974. The language orientation of the Filipino bilingual in terms of fluency, domains, and usage. Unpublished manuscript. Ateneo-PNC Consortium.

BROOK, G. L. 1958. A history of the English language. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

CANDLER, W.J. 1977. Teaching English as a second dialect in Liberia. English Language teaching journal. XXXI.2. (January).

CASTILLO, EMMA S. and ROSITA G. GALANG. 1973. Tagalog-English switching in the Greater Manila area: A preliminary investigation. Unpublished manuscript. Ateneo-PNC consortium.

CHOMSKY, NOAM and MORRIS HALLE. 1968. The sound pattern of English. New York: Harper and Row.

CREWE, W., ed. 1977. The English language in Singapore. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

DAR, RODRIGO A. 1973. A study on the nature of Filipinism? Unpublished M.A. thesis. Ateneo de Manila University.

FRANCIS, W. NELSON. 1967. The English language. London: English Universities Press.

FRIES, CHARLES C. 1952. The structure of English. An introduction to the construction of English sentences. New York: Hardcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

GLEECK, LOUIS, JR. 1977. The Manila Americans (1901-1964) Manila: Carmelo and Bauermann.

GLISSMEYER, GLORIA. 1973. Some characteristics of English in Hawaii. Varieties of present-day English, eds. by Bailey, Richard W. and Jay L. Robinson. New York: The MacMillan Co.

GOKAK, V.K. 1964. English in India: its present and future. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

GONZALEZ, ANDREW, FSC. 1972. Review of Teodoro A. Llamzon's Standard Filipino English. Philippine Journal for Language Teaching

HAMILTON, D.E. 1962. Standard Canadian English pronunciation. Proceedings of the ninth international congress of linguistics. Lunt Horace ed. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

HAYDEN, JOSEPH RALSTON. 1947. The Philippines A study in national development. New York: The MacMillan Company.

HEMPHILL, RODERICK J. 1962. Background readings in language teaching. Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, Inc.

JAMIAS, CRISTINO. 1951. Our literature in English. Literary Apprentice.

JOOS, MARTIN. 1969. Five clocks. New York: Hardcourt Brace.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. 1965. Indian English: A study in contextualization. In C.E. Barell et al. (eds.), In memory of J. R. Firth. London: Longmans.

_____. 1969. English in South Asia. Current trends in linguistics, Volume 5. ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 627-678. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1978. The pragmatics of non-native varieties of English. Preliminary version of an invited paper for the Conference on English as an international auxiliary language (EIAL) April 1-15, 1978, organized by the East-West Center, East-West Culture Learning Institute, Honolulu, Hawaii.

KELZ, HEINRICH. 1977. Binary features for the determination of articulary settings. Proceedings of the Third World Congress of Phonetics, ed. by. M. Omishi, Tokyo.

KENYON, JOHN SAMUEL and THOMAS ALBERT KNOTT. 1953. A pronouncing dictionary of American English. Springfield, Massachusetts: G & C Merriam Company.

KILLINGLEY, SIEW YUE. 1965. A phonological, grammatical, and lexical description of Malayan English. M.A. thesis, University of Malaysia.

KRAPP, GEORGE P. 1955. The English language in America. 2 Vols. New York.

LABOV, WILLIAM. 1966. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

LLAMZON, TEODORO A. 1969. Standard Filipino English. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

LOMBOS-ESQUILLO, MARIA TERESITA. 1978. Contextualization of the language proficiency of selected bilingual college students. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Ateneo de Manila University.

MARCKWARDT, ALBERT H. 1958. American English. New York: Oxford University Press.

MARTINEZ, NORMA D. 1975. Standard Filipino English pronunciation. Manila: National Book Store, Inc.

MENCKEN, H. L. 1919. The American language. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

MEYER, RAYMOND. 1968. English in the Philippines: a perspective in language and culture. San Beda Review 3.156-173.

MONROE, PAUL. 1925. Survey of the educational system of the Philippines. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

OTANES, FE T. and BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN. 1969. Language policy survey in the Philippines: initial report. Prepublication ed. Manila: Philippine Normal College. Reprinted: 1972.

PASCASIO, EMY M. and ARACELI HIDALGO. 1972. How role-relationships, domains, and speech situations affect language use among bilinguals. Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Science, Chicago, August 3, 1973, World Anthropology.

PIKE, KENNETH L. & CHARLES C. FRIES. 1949. Coexistent Phonemic Systems. Language Vol. 25; 29-50.

PONIO, NORDIAN, EUSOOF. 1974. Determining the sensitivity of educated Filipino and American English speakers to Filipinisms found in leading newspapers. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Santo Tomas.

POVEY, JOHN. 1977. The role of English in Africa. English Teaching Forum. XV.7.27-8.

PRANINSKAS, JEAN. 1961. Rapid review of English Grammar. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

PRATOR, CLIFFORD H. 1968. The British heresy in TESL. In Language problems of developing nations, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson, and Jyotirinda Das Gupta, 459-76. New Yor: John Wiley & Sons.

QUIRK, RANDOLPH and SIDNEY GREENBAUM. 1973. A university grammar of English. London: Longman.

RAMSON, W.S., ed. 1970. English transported: Essays on Australisian English. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

RAQUEÑO, PEDRO G. 1952. A comparative study of the types of errors in English written compositions of Filipino public high school students in 1936 and 1950. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Santo Tomas, Manila.

REYNOLDS, WILLIAM. 1973. Dialects in America. New York: Random House, Inc.

SCHACHTER, PAUL and FE T. OTANES. 1972. Tagalog reference grammar. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SEY, K.A. 1973. Ghanian English: an exploratory survey. London and Basingstoke: MacMillan.

SPENCER, JOHN. ed. 1971. The English language in Africa. London: Longman.

SWANSON SURVEY. 1960. A survey of the Philippine public schools of the Philippines 1960. Manila: Carmelo and Bauermann.

TAY, MARY W. J. 1978. The uses, users and features of English in Singapore: A test case of the EIAL question. An invited paper for a Conference on English as an International Auxiliary Language, East-West Culture Learning Institute, The East-West Center, Honolulu, April 1-15, 1978.

TONGUE, R.K. 1974. The English of Singapore and Malaysia: ESM. Singapore: Eastern University Press Sdn. Rhd.

TUCKER, RICHARD G. 1968. Judging personality from language usage: A Filipino example. Mimeographed. Manila.

TURNER, G.W. 1966. The English language in Australia and New Zealand. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

WALATARA, D. 1960. The scope and limitations of bilingualism with a second language with specific reference to the case of Ceylon. Teaching English 6.3.3-9.

WOLFRAM, WALTER A. 1969. A sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro speech. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

_____. 1974. Sociolinguistic aspects of assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City. Arlington, Virginia: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

_____. 1974. The study of social dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

WONG, IRENE F.H. 1977. English as an international auxiliary language in Malaysia. Unpublished manuscript.

YABES, LEOPOLDO Y., ed. 1975. Philippine short stories 1924-1940. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

YAP, GLORIA CHAN. 1974. Hokkien Chinese borrowings in Tagalog. Unpublished doctoral dissertaion. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University-Philippine Normal College Consortium.